

INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION
AND
CASTE PROBLEMS

SOLUTIONS

BY

A. H. BENTON, I.C.S. (RETD.)

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1917 .

All rights reserved

Universitatî Aberdonensî

Almæ Matri Cum Bona Veniâ

Opusculum Hocce

Beneficiis Cumulatus Animo Gratissimo

D. D. D.

Scriptor

PREFACE

THIS little work is placed before a public engrossed in all the perplexities of a stupendous war. The reason for the intrusion is, that it is a response to an invitation to the public issued by the Government of India more than three years ago, which was incomplete, when the war storm supervened. It concerns comparatively few of the British public ; it will, it is hoped, interest a larger number of our Indian fellow-subjects, with whose business it attempts to deal. It is hoped that amid current distractions they may find leisure to give it careful consideration, and to decide whether the proposals made are likely to cure or to mitigate the evils from which they suffer. Judging by the numbers of anarchist trials in progress in the courts in various Provinces engaged in their disposal, there is no respite from them, nor is any likely until special measures are adopted to stifle anarchy at the source, and to promote sound administration in the Department of Education.

The author regrets to find himself compelled to differ from the Indian Government in regard to a policy with respect to religion, which it has approved and has professed to follow for more than a century. He respectfully submits that the policy of neutrality in matters of religion has never been clearly explained ; that it has yielded very uncertain guidance ; that it has been constantly violated in the Department of Education and also on various important occasions ; that it is incompatible with the spirit which inspires the Royal Proclamation of 1858. He suggests its abandonment in favour of the system of mutual religious toleration, which is one of the most glorious boons bestowed by the English race on humanity. He maintains that the latter policy, by manifesting not indifference, but a favourable and respectful attitude towards all religions, would conciliate the Indian races ; that it would repress disaffection ; that it would give the Government all the freedom, at present lacking, required for obtaining the aid of the

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III

OPERATIONS OF THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

The Department had a fairly early start in India, as compared with other countries—Grant by Parliament of £10,000 in 1813—Debates as to the intention of Parliament—Committee of Public Instruction appointed in 1823—Issued its first report in 1831—Novel desire to learn English reported—Stalemate in committee as to Oriental and Western Education—Reference to Governor General in Council for decision—Duff's operations in Calcutta—Arrival of Macaulay, New Legal member—His Minute on the reference—The Minute commented on—Minute takes no notice of Duff's work—Quotations from the Minute with reference to Macaulay's notions about neutrality—Conduct explained and defended, so far as possible—Macaulay's and Duff's predictions compared—Governor-General's decision in favour of the Anglicists—Court of Directors' Despatch of 1854—The Despatch leaves religion and morals entirely out of account—Indigenous schools one result of this—In 1882 commission was appointed to determine how far the policy of the Despatch had been carried out and to make suggestions—Report very valuable but marred by the want of any finding as to the observance of neutrality in respect of religion—Proposed a moral text-book based on the principles of natural religion—Mr Telang's minute of dissent as regards this—Various agencies for educational work considered

CHAPTER IV

THE RELATION OF THE STATE TO RELIGION, SUITABLY DEFINED

Historic account of State Control down to the time of Henry VIII.—Troubles in English history till the Revolution when policy of toleration was initiated—Locke's account of toleration—Toleration Act described and synopsis of contents given—Toleration system one of England's glories—India missed it by some accident—The Indian Government apart from orders from the Home Government is quite at liberty to adopt a policy of toleration—Under the system of toleration the Government could employ committees to teach morals in accordance with religion, if the same offer were available for all—The Government would exercise no initiative in regard to the religious ideas offered to it, but merely accept or reject them along with the moral notions suggested, if it found them as a whole unsuitable—The policy of neutrality, a doubtful one, much in need of explanation—Incompatible with the system of toleration and with the practice of the Indian Government on various occasions—Particularly the grant to the Benares Hindu University—Especially is it out of accord with the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, the promises of which ought to be strictly observed—Suitable definition proposed and recommended for adoption as likely to promote loyalty and to afford the Government more freedom in providing safeguards likely to be efficacious

CHAPTER V

RELIGION AND MORALITY: THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS

Definitions of religion and morality—Religions the sources of morality—The character of the latter dependent on the former—Direct Moral Instruction method clashes with the definition—Religion operates powerfully on human feelings and emotions—Religion dominated ancient morals—

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
Philosophy of Aristotle important—Kept clear of dealing with religion—Aristotle's analysis of the Moral Faculty—No appeal to it, being only rudimentary—Peripatetics took no account of religion—Stoic's single God of nature—Cleanthes' hymn to Zeus—Stoics' system subjective—Romans favour for Stoic system—The moral sense brought on the religious stage at Rome—Conscience a power in the Roman world— <i>Locus classicus</i> of Scripture addressed to Romans—Recognition of conscience a development of Christianity—St. Paul's acquaintance with Roman conscience, how acquired—Religion, life and breath of morals—Which predominant now, morality or religion?—Philosophy of conscience—Government interference with religion justified as in case of Satī—The masses of Indian communities under the domination of religion	81

CHAPTER VI

MORAL IMPROVEMENT AND REFORMATION

Diverse moralities, how unified—They are all convergent—General agreement as to good men—Illustration from India—Principle of specific treatment recommended—Scientific principle, often at variance with religious traditions—Palliative operating in the West—Adjustment of conduct to fresh conviction—Illustration—Indian anarchists	92
--	----

CHAPTER VII

REMEDIAL MEASURES

Comparison of results with those of the Bombay and Allahabad Conferences—Accord and verification by correspondence—Method of Direct Moral Instruction found inadequate—Many moral systems found prevailing—Morals found included in religion according to popular views—Some scheme like that of the "Boy Scouts" recommended—Examination in morals and religion recommended to exorcise the examination fiend—No importance attached to these proposals, made in passing—Independent committees corresponding to the various existing communities to be established to teach morals in accordance with the religions of the pupils—Special nature of the teaching described—Reasons for the special character—Committees how to be appointed, how continued—Character of syllabus—Its preparation, a voyage of discovery—A section in syllabus devoted to local matter, folk-lore, folk-songs—Pattern Christian syllabus suggested—Suggestions for preparation and reasons—Experiment first to be made with higher schools and colleges before extension to all such and to elementary schools—Buildings in neighbourhood to be provided for the purpose—Government should meet the cost of the experiment—Advantages calculated to attend the new departure, if taken—Results of the inquiry summarised	96
---	----

APPENDIX	113
--------------------	-----

INDEX	117
-----------------	-----

INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION AND CASTE PROBLEMS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE subject of this short treatise points to a political, administrative and moral problem of immense importance. Its right solution is of the deepest interest not only to India and its peoples, but also to the British Empire with all its Oversea Dominions. In short, it may even be maintained that the question is one of world-wide concern.

About a fifth of the whole human race dwell within the Indian territories. Their extent and their well-defined natural features are calculated to form a possible sphere of immense political power, when the inhabitants have been moulded by sufficient civil and political experience, and have learned to keep their ranks and to march in step with their fellow-subjects elsewhere. India lies geographically in the centre of the self-governing British Dominions, each of them in all probability destined to attain an equal rank with the Great Powers of the planet. The Overseas Dominions' ideal is that they shall remain united to the mother country "if not by constitutional arrangements at any rate by mutual service, mutual interests, and mutual devotion" (Mr. Balfour's tribute to Mr. Chamberlain, Commons, 7th July, 1914). The Indian ideal should be at some distant date the attainment of a similar position. The tide of human affairs is working steadily and powerfully in this direction. Indian troops have been employed, fighting with the utmost gallantry the battles of the Empire at the same time in five different quarters. The Indian populations under British guidance may look forward to being bound together by a common language, a common law and a common interest in each other. Thus India

2 INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION AND CASTE PROBLEMS

should firmly hope to become in the course of centuries, a mighty, self-possessed, self-governed, all but independent Power, only like the Dominions bound to a benignant Patron by devoted loyalty, hallowed in the lapse of ages. The progress of events and of the opinions and tendencies developed by the war, moreover, seems to indicate that, in order to settle the world's peace on a sure foundation, a complete federation of the Mother country, of the Dominions and of all governments under British auspices, must be attempted and strenuously striven for without loss of time.

If the prospect just suggested is to be realised, and India is ever to have a recognised place in the comity of nations, her people as a whole must acquire a character for patience, persistence, steadfastness and moderation in the conduct of public affairs, approaching those of the peoples, with which she desires to be associated in the administration of their share of the world. It must be remembered that for well-nigh a millennium the latter have been leading all mankind in teaching themselves and others the principles of government by the people for the people, while the task is still far from complete. India's latest conquerors have been highly successful in advancing her material prosperity. No enemy has in their time ventured to assail her from the outside. Within her bounds life and property have always remained secure save for one limited period in a single province and its neighbourhood, when the *Pax Britannica* was interrupted. The successful administration of justice has ever been a strong feature of British rule, in glaring contrast with the times that preceded it. In fact, Indians have been furnished not only with great facilities for obtaining justice, but they have at the same time earned for themselves a great reputation for abusing them, in order to indulge their litigious instincts, and thereby wreak vengeance on their enemies. This indicates, it may be observed, not any defect of the Courts of Justice, but rather an urgent need for improving and strengthening the general conscience, so as to curb eristic propensities, nowhere so extravagantly displayed as in the highest philosophies dealing with the problems of the Universe, God and Soul, spirit and matter, reality and illusion.

Following the example of the Roman conquerors of old in their dominions, the British were almost the first to introduce into the country grand highway communications, solidly constructed. In a modern State, however, in competition with all the countries of

the world, in the age of scientific inventions, besides good roads, scores of other conveniences and appliances are demanded to meet human requirements. Without the conquest, it is hard to see how India could have secured the postal and telegraph services or the railway system extending to over 30,000 miles. She has an English and vernacular press, so vigorous as to require a certain amount of restraint and guidance. She has a complete system of agricultural land registration in connection with the land revenue administration. Municipalities and district boards have been instituted throughout the land; they render valuable service to their communities and serve to call out the leaders of the people and to initiate them in the work of local administration. The limit has almost been reached in applying the waters of all her magnificent rivers, to increase by irrigation agricultural produce and to bring under cultivation wide tracts, which otherwise must have remained barren waste. Much attention has been given to sanitation: much thought and money have been devoted to the prevention and extirpation of many diseases, which carried off or debilitated large masses of the population. Many other material boons might be indicated, for which India is indebted to her present rulers.

In short, in developing the resources of the Indian Continent, in furthering trade, commerce and industry, in promoting the material comfort and welfare of its immense population, the Indian Government has a record which falls little short of any ideal that could have been anticipated.

That is, it is admitted, a British way of looking at the material aspect of recent advancement; if an Indian were sketching the picture, it would doubtless be of a much more sombre character; Indians have but scant esteem for ideals of that nature; they would be much more readily gratified by a lively interest in their spiritual possessions and a similar strenuous effort to make the best of them.

Turning then to the spiritual sphere of development, we find ourselves in a much less comfortable region. This cannot be attributed to any lack of amenability to mental culture on the part of the people, for they are on the whole kindly, docile, alert, keen-spirited, high and low one of the best-mannered peoples in the world, and they would appear to offer a very promising field for right spiritual treatment. There does not appear to be much to quarrel with for the present, all things considered, as to the extent

4 INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION AND CASTE PROBLEMS

of educational facilities. Leaving female education out of account, not as unimportant, but for the sake of simplicity merely, we find that elementary education already covers something short of one-third of the ground it occupies in more advanced communities.

There is no doubt but that ethical training ought to be co-extensive with secular education. The proverb, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it," contains the soundest wisdom. In India we have to a very large extent neglected it. The Court of Directors' Despatch of 1854, the Magna Charta of Indian Education, not only prohibits religious instruction in government (including municipal and board) schools and colleges, but also makes no provision for ethical training, anywhere; it relies entirely for moral progress on improvement of the intellect. We have greatly enhanced this sad defect by imposing universally a system of examination for advancement in life through the public services and for preparation for the universities. This system leaves outside its scope both religion and morals, and so effectually discourages all voluntary attention to proficiency therein. The result is a plague spot among those who have received the higher education. The Indian education problem has been pressed on public attention by the operations of anarchists, which were constantly in evidence throughout the period covered by the last Quinquennial Report (1908-1912 inclusive). The agents for perpetrating the many hideous and menacing outrages of the last seven or eight years have been chiefly, if not entirely, either Hindu students or Hindus fresh from school or college. This feature is important; an explanation will be offered, why no Muslims appear amongst the offenders. The most notable was the deplorable outrage on His Excellency the Viceroy on the 23rd December, 1912, at Delhi, on his formal entry into the new capital; when a bomb was thrown which severely wounded his Excellency and killed an attendant. The years 1913 and 1914 up to the outbreak of war showed no improvement, a distressingly large portion of an Indian weekly paper being constantly devoted to anarchist crimes and trials in various places. Every week chronicled the occurrence of murderous attacks on distinguished persons and zealous public servants. The patriotic demonstrations throughout India, which the war evoked, appeared to allay the anarchic spirit for a number of months, but then there seemed to follow a vigorous recrudescence

of the evil. During the year 1915 special tribunals presided over by three judges sat for long periods, if not continuously, occupied with the trial of cases described in the newspaper headings as "Political Conspiracies," in which large gangs were accused of robberies (dacoities) accompanied with murder with a view to secure funds for the overthrow of the British Government. It is not possible to ascertain from the reports that the accused had all of them been students, but the fact that some were, appears incidentally. The Lahore case, the most notable of these State trials, with sixty-three accused, was traced to a student who held a scholarship at Oxford, awarded by the Panjab Government (*Times*, 17th November, 1915). In February, 1916, there were three Special Tribunals sitting in three provinces. That at Lahore was occupied with a supplement to the Lahore State Trial in which there were seventy-one accused and one thousand witnesses to be examined for the defence alone (*Pioneer Mail* of 12th February, 1916). The pressing need for effectual action, whether in or outside the Education Department, to put an end to the source of disorders, is more than ever clearly demonstrated.

The urgency of the situation has been admitted by the government over and over again. At the opening of the Indian Imperial Council, on the 25th January, 1910, the Viceroy, Lord Minto, referred to the subject in these words: "The present dangers we are prepared to meet; the moral training of the rising generation our duty will no longer allow us to neglect."

More than three years after we have a full deliverance of the Government of India on the subject of education reform in the Government resolution in the Department of Education, dated Delhi, 21st February, 1913. I think it worth while to transfer the whole passage, although of considerable length, to these pages, because it will serve for easy reference and because it enables us to understand exactly where we are, so far as the Government is concerned, where there is no enigma involved.

"DIRECT RELIGIOUS AND MORAL INSTRUCTION.

"5. The question of religious and moral instruction was discussed at a local conference held in Bombay and subsequently at the Imperial Conference held in Allahabad in February, 1911. Grave differences

6 INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION AND CASTE PROBLEMS

of opinion emerged as to the possibility or advantage of introducing direct religious instruction into schools generally, and apprehensions of difficulty in the working of any definite system were put forward. Doubts were also expressed as to the efficacy of direct moral instruction, when divorced from religious sanctions. In the matter of moral teaching, however, the difficulties are undoubtedly less than in the case of religious teaching. The papers laid before the conference indicate that not a little moral instruction is already given in the ordinary text-books and in other ways. The Government of Bombay are engaged upon the preparation of a book containing 'moral illustrations,' which will be placed in the hands of teachers, in order to assist them in imparting moral instruction. Excellent materials for ethical teaching are available in the Mahabharata, the Ramayana, portions of Hafiz, Sadi, Maulana Rumi and other classics in Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, and Pali. The Government of India, while bound to maintain a position of complete neutrality in matters of religion, observe that the most thoughtful minds in India lament the tendency to develop the intellectual at the expense of the moral and religious faculties. In September, 1911, they invited Local Governments, other than the Bombay Government, to assemble local committees in order to consider the whole question. Such committees are still at work in some provinces. For the present the Government of India must be content to watch experiments and keep the matter prominently in view. Enlightened opinion and accumulated experience will, it is hoped, provide a practical solution to what is unquestionably the most important educational problem of the time."

This extract will afford a convenient text wherewith to summarise the chief points at issue and thereby give the reader a bird's-eye view of the discussions that shall occupy our attention in the sequel.

It appears a good omen, a sign of grace, that the Government bound by neutrality was able to countenance the discussion of religious and moral instruction at two conferences held at Bombay and Allahabad in 1911. The aloofness of neutrality might well have been expected to ban all reference to religion. Another good omen is that Government is watching experiments, that it sees clearly that the education problem to be solved is "unquestionably the most important educational problem of the time" and

that it is hopeful of a practical solution. This sums up, it seems, the whole matter of a favourable nature to be found in the pronouncement. It betokens a *benevolent* neutrality. The neutrality would become still more benevolent, if it were only observed in practice or if it would only take itself away to limbo and resign the place it should never have occupied to something more English, more rational. If the business in hand had any concern with war or diplomacy there might be much to be said for it; for internal civil administration, where the business in hand is not to worst opponents by diplomatic art or somehow, where earnestness and sincerity should be the keynote, its introduction appears a sad mistake. It means literally, siding with neither of two parties. Who the two parties intended are, perhaps hardly any one knows. There are many parties and there should be kindness and goodwill to all. The most illustrious and the most talented advocate of Indian education at an important crisis, as will appear, failed to comprehend it. What can be hoped of people less capable? What of the ignorant masses? It originated with the Court of Directors in the Napoleonic era (*Despatch*, dated 7th September, 1808. Howell, p. 9). That is some excuse for its authors. Yet it is hard to understand how even they overlooked the principle of toleration expounded by English philosophy, first won for mankind after many persecutions, after a very troubled history and great expenditure of English tears and bloodshed.

The Government of India does not appear to be bound by the principle of neutrality save by its own choice as to its expediency and by long use. Brought to a standstill, we may say, by pursuing it, it will have a fresh opportunity of considering its future adherence to it. In this connection some remarks of His Excellency the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, at laying the foundation of the Hindu University at Benares are well worth pondering. "But I am not terrified," said His Excellency, "by the bogey of religious intolerance; rather do I think that a deep belief in and reverence for one's own religion ought to foster a spirit of respect for the religious convictions of others and signs are not wanting that the day is dawning, when tolerance and mutual good-will shall take the place of fanaticism and hatred."

These words, it may be observed, are a worthy echo of the Royal Proclamation of 1858.

8 INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION AND CASTE PROBLEMS

The following brief notes touch on other leading features of our text to be discussed hereafter :—

No common sense could advocate the teaching of religion in mixed schools. Both teacher and pupils would be a laughing-stock to the other spectators. Such unfortunately is human nature !

There should be no doubt as to the efficacy of moral teaching divorced from religious sanctions, in India at least. The experiment of the Buddha, which lasted for about 1500 years and failed, appears to prove quite clearly that Indians attach the highest importance to the influence of spiritual religion on human conduct and have very little reliance on the teaching of morals which lacks this support. This has a very important bearing on the value to be assigned to the direct moral teaching imparted to pupils in Government schools and colleges.

As little doubt should there be, that a teacher, not qualified to teach religion to any particular class of pupils, is not in a position to give them the special moral instruction required in accordance therewith.

The quantity of materials for ethical instruction to be found in this or that quarter is, it is most humbly and respectfully submitted, a very secondary consideration ; the *special quality*, having regard to the pupils concerned, is the first and most important point.

These views will be advocated in the sequel by the writer to the best of his ability ; he proposes to recommend a scheme of moral instruction in accordance with the various religions of the pupils, after it has been tested by an experiment in the Secondary Schools, where the need is most urgent, or in a portion of them.

The sphere to which the experiment would be applied, its extent and the consequent cost would be left to the discretion of the authorities concerned.

The resolution of the Government of India may fairly be regarded as containing a clear invitation to the outside public to render it assistance in solving a most baffling problem. Three years have passed, and, so far as I am aware, there has been no response whatever on the part of men of light and leading in the fields of religion, philosophy, literature, and politics, who might here find a subject worthy of elucidation by their best efforts. Is it not, I must ask myself with my comparatively slender resources, great rashness and presumption on my part, to dream of dealing with

such a task ? The only excuse I can offer, is that I am attempting it, *faute de mieux* ; that this effort of mine may at least tempt those with the best qualifications to come to the rescue.

Living at a distance from India I could scarcely have ventured to publish my notions without some more intimate acquaintance with what had been recently said and done on the spot, than is to be obtained by reading Indian newspapers. I am very grateful to the Indian Department of Education, which at the request of my old friend, the Honourable Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Lieut.-Governor of the Panjab has favoured me with the official documents noted below,¹ concerning educational doings. So I have been relieved of anxiety on this score.

With a view to the effective disentanglement of our theme it appears necessary to discuss first, certain common features, pervading Indian existence, of a special character ; and thereafter in succession a series of questions bearing on religion, state interference, morals, philosophy and history. The reader may not feel convinced at each stage of our progress that the ground we are treading is strictly relevant. He ought to bear in mind that we are dealing with ancient religions, strange to most of us, also with ancient communities the great masses of which are living in social conditions, which we have left long behind us. For the successful handling of such topics, it appears desirable that we should in some measure endeavour to create for ourselves a certain antique atmosphere, to which we are strangers. This may most easily be effected, it seems, by several historic sketches, which will serve to explain how the present position has been reached and to determine what modification of the same may be desirable and practicable. The first of these subjects to be dealt with is the curious union of singular, unique conditions of unknown antiquity, prevailing almost throughout the wide extent of the Indian territories.

The two proposals, set out in the title page, may at first sight appear to have no intimate connection with each other or even to be antagonistic. As to antagonism, it may be observed, that in India, where caste is generally prevalent, the utterance of the word evokes no sentiment of moral disparagement, as it does in

¹ (1) Report of the proceedings of a conference in Bombay on Moral, Civic and Sanitary Instruction, 1910

(2) Papers regarding the Educational Conference, Allahabad, February, 1911.

(3) Three other series of documents of which no use has been made.

10 INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION AND CASTE PROBLEMS

the West. The relation between the two, will, it is trusted, clearly appear from the following explanation.

The moral instruction of the children of a community, with only one religion prevalent, is doubtless a very exalted and a very exacting theme. The Founder of Christianity thought proper to bestow special attention on children and to treat them with a distinction, which did not commend itself to the bystanders. A close imitation of His attitude and of His methods of teaching morality will be earnestly enjoined, because it appears to afford the best promise of success in the general treatment of the subject.

A plurality of religions, even if they are not very numerous, greatly enhances the difficulty of the moral training of the young. A very considerable part of all the energies of all the churches in these islands, we can see, is devoted to the religious and moral instruction of young people. When the number of religions, cults, sects and castes is, as in India, without any limit (over 2000 we are told), the work of moral upbringing assumes an aspect of overwhelming magnitude and difficulty. The only hope of dealing with it successfully appears to lie in the possibility of utilising the agencies of the social framework, which causes the overpowering complexity, to provide also the means of coping with and overcoming it. Hence arises the urgent need for a rational explanation of the nature and origin of Indian caste, based on facts of no recondite character, which all can appreciate. Government and its supporters, the general body politic, we may say, cannot be expected to be content with accounts, based on mythology, tradition or the revelation of any particular religion, when it devolves on caste authorities most important public duties. The Indian Census Commissioner has pronounced the origin of caste to be an "insoluble conundrum." Nevertheless a simple theory of the subject will be propounded in the next chapter and supported by all available argument. The writer hopes it may obtain acceptance, achieve at least a modicum of success. If he fail to make such headway in respect to both problems, he must resign himself to accept a verdict of failure, more or less complete, as regards the work in hand. Meanwhile he will confidently indulge the hope of a favourable issue. Should the notions he propounds be found anywhere near the mark, he is fully aware that much pioneer work will still remain for men on the spot, who alone can deal effectually with details in all their diversity.

CHAPTER II

VARIOUS UNIQUE FEATURES OF INDIAN LIFE

THE foregoing statement would seem to justify a belief that India is a patient suffering from a serious internal malady. I am attempting to suggest a suitable remedy. It would obviously be rash to imagine that any safe conclusion on such a subject could be arrived at without some study of the patient's previous history, constitutional habits, nature and character. It may well be hoped that we may thereby gain valuable insight as to the nature of the complaint and be able to discern what treatment is likely to be favourable and what the reverse.

The Indian Peninsula is a country with remarkable natural boundaries. It has the ocean on the east and west, and on the land side it is enclosed all round from sea to sea by lofty mountain ranges, that on the north side being the loftiest in the world. Geographically it stands on one side of the great human highways; it is well secluded from the routes of early mankind in their migrations from East to West or *vice versâ*. It was possible, therefore, for its early population in this seclusion for a long period, to which no limit can be assigned, to develop over an extensive territory its own innate powers and tendencies and thereby to display singular results, to which no parallel can be found elsewhere.

Such an outcome was, moreover, greatly favoured by another geological feature, which has served to make the whole country in course of time move together in the past, and accordingly should not be left out of account in any speculation as to matters anterior to all record. I am alluding to that zone of sedimentary strata, which extends from the Indus right away without a break to the Bay of Bengal; it thus includes the Indus and the Ganges valleys, watered by these great rivers and by their numerous tributaries. The basins combined have been computed to extend to over 300,000 square miles. This whole territory is alluvial soil, easily cultivated

and, with the exception of certain not very extensive desert tracts, fairly supplied with water. Any power in possession of a portion is likely to acquire the remainder at no distant date, or to lose what it has got. By the battle of Plassy Clive gained for the British Government the grant of the administration of Bengal at the east end from the Mughal Emperor; in ninety-two years from that time the whole of the remaining territory in question had come under British sway.

Another point worthy of notice is, that any power which strongly holds this immense riverain tract must acquire and maintain dominion or a supreme influence over the remainder of the peninsula. This has been proved repeatedly by the history of the past 2500 years.

According to our earliest information the whole sub-continent was at one time occupied by tribes, which we must call aboriginal, because we know nothing of their existence outside India. They spoke languages belonging to the Dravido-Mundan family. Over a wide extent of country to the north of the Vindhya, where Aryan languages are now spoken, these aboriginal tongues are no longer in use with one exception, that of the Brahuis in Baluchistan and Sind, but there remain in the Aryan speech now in use clear aboriginal traces. Many Dravidian words occur in the vocabularies and many words of the Aryan languages, which do not use the cerebral letters, have become infected by this pronunciation. The grammar of the various Aryan tongues seems to have been likewise affected by Dravidian usages (Census of India, 1901, Report, page 308). The conclusion just stated finds abundant support in many notices of Dravidian tribes scattered through "The Indian Village Community" (1896), by B. H. Baden Powell. The author, at page 160, says, "There is reason to believe that extensive Dravidian races were to be found even in Northern India. For this we have no direct explanation to offer." At page 107 we find the following quotation from the Gazetteer of the Benares district: "The traditions of the whole province represent the Bhār (a Dravidian tribe) as once dominant from the Tarāi of Naipal to the hills of Sāgar in the Central Provinces." There is also, at the same place, a quotation from the Ghazipur Gazetteer to this effect: "The testimony of tradition that the middle Ganges Valley was formerly occupied by Non-Aryan aboriginal races is the evidence, not of

one but of a hundred concurrent traditions of all land-owning tribes in the Benares Province, in Oudh and in Bihar." We have thus, it appears, made good the important starting point that India was held through its whole extent by races similar to those which now dwell in the south. No doubt races of other families of speech were making their appearance on the northern and eastern borders, but they were not in numbers to materially affect the correctness of the statement just made or to affect any considerable extent of territory.

Now the form of land tenure generally prevalent over more than two-thirds of the whole of India, the Panjab and United Provinces forming less than one third in extent being the exception, is known as the raiyatwari tenure ("The Indian Village Community," p. 8). The Dravidian aboriginal tribes seem well entitled to claim it as their own institution. We may imagine a village constituted under it in this way: A member of a tribe desires to cultivate a portion of the waste held by the tribe. He applies to his fellow-tribesmen, or rather to the chief who represents them, and obtains permission to make a clearance and till the ground on the understanding that his possession will be respected in consideration of his yielding up to the tribe or its ruler a certain portion of the produce. Other members of the tribe make similar clearances alongside on like terms. They obtain a site near by and build houses near each other for protection, so that they may be near their work and be able also to protect their crops. Each member is only liable to the chief for the demand on his own holding. The members have no title to the waste, which belongs to the tribe or its ruler. The latter appoints a headman and an assistant able to keep accounts in order to look after his interests. They may or they may not be remunerated by sufficient free holdings; the offices may be hereditary or otherwise. The members of the tribe, who have secured holdings, for their own comfort and in order to make their village self-contained, have to attract a body of simple craftsmen and menials to do their work and to attend to their wants, say, a blacksmith, potter, cobbler, carpenter, washerman, sweeper, barber, and so on, or several of the same. These workers are remunerated by certain payments and customary allowances. They are all provided with sites for houses in the village or outside. We thus obtain a community, qualified to maintain its existence, and independent of any assistance from outside.

We have shown that there are good grounds for holding that aboriginal tribes of a certain type were in ancient times settled over the length and breadth of India. We have equally good reason for believing that villages, constituted as just described, as they would be by these tribes, were in existence in all parts of the country to the extent to which in that remote era agriculture had made progress. This tenure by which each individual member of the village community (raiyyat) is only responsible for his own holding gives rise to the simpler form of the Indian Village Community. The other form is the Joint Village Community in which the whole village land is to be regarded as a unity, which may be partitioned among the community with every variety of complication. The raiyyatwari tenure is liable to be converted into the joint village tenure by conquest, purchase, overlordship, or any circumstance which may enable the village lands to be treated as a unit for partition among those interested.

The foregoing explanations may be sufficient to account for certain uniformities of land settlement, administration, and residence, which could not, it may safely be asserted, be found prevailing in any other area of equal extent. I am alluding to three facts. In the first place the British Indian and Native Governments are either owners of the soil according to immemorial usage, or they are entitled to receive from the occupiers a fixed portion of the produce, approximating to one-fourth of the whole or a half of the net produce; it is of little importance whether the case be stated in one way or the other. The account of the raiyyatwari tenure and its supposed universal prevalence in ancient times should serve to indicate how it has come about that the Government is provided with this large revenue from the land. Even if the tenure be destroyed by conquest this need not affect the interest of the Government, as it will only substitute a joint village community, responsible to the State for the previous aggregate of individuals.

The second fact is that throughout India, apart from the Zamindari and Talukdari tenures in Bengal and Oudh, respectively, which for our purpose may be disregarded, the land is held by village communities in relation with the State. The raiyyatwari tenure, if at one time universally prevalent, would be largely conducive to giving large sections of the population a firm hold on the land and thereby enhancing and maintaining their status.

The third fact is that the great mass of the people live in villages, many of them still surrounded by walls. At one stage of human progress in India, as elsewhere, mankind was dependent for subsistence on spontaneous produce, on hunting and fishing, and on the pasturage of domesticated animals. In that primitive age the tribe population would be living in the open, free to move from place to place as pasturage and other means of subsistence served. There would be a great change in social arrangements when they were able to have recourse to the increased resources of agriculture. The number of menials and craftsmen would be greatly increased. The latter would be required to provide the tools and implements demanded by the new industry. The numbers of the former would be larger when there would be increased resources to maintain them, and when there would be a greater demand for services and comforts by wealthier communities. They would be leading a changed life in the confined village settlements, which had to be substituted for encampments moving from place to place in the open country. Former social arrangements would no longer answer in the new situation. If class distinctions were to be maintained, if the land holders in direct contract with the rulers were to assert a position superior to the menials who served them and to the artisans, strict social regulations would have to be enforced as to social intercourse and many restrictions heretofore unnecessary would have to be submitted to. The institution of the system of caste ought, it appears, to be assigned to the primitive era when some progress had been made in agriculture. Something of the sort could no more be dispensed with than the sudden abrogation of caste in the present age could be contemplated without the gravest apprehensions; the result would undoubtedly be social chaos and confusion not to be thought of.

It would not, it is submitted, be too rash an assumption to make, that agriculture had its earliest and greatest triumphs in India in the alluvial zone just referred to, which may be regarded as the key to Indian influence and dominion. There its processes had every facility provided for them by nature; there they were likely to yield the largest returns; only a beginning was required in order to permit of indefinite extension and ultimately to pervade the whole sphere of operations of the same character. When the plains were to a large extent subdued by human effort, action on the same

lines would be applied to the hills and valleys from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin. It is thus I explain to myself the unexampled prevalence in India of unique systems of land tenure, of taxation and of human habitation, in striking contrast with the haphazard varieties to be found in the same spheres of human action and existence in other countries. Each of these topics may be further dealt with in the sequel, as occasion offers.

We are now prepared to discuss a fourth well-known characteristic of Indian life. It has a very close bearing on the theme I am treating, concerned as it is with human conduct. It cannot, moreover, be altogether safely lost sight of in India, whatever the matter in hand may be. The Hindu community, more than two-thirds of the whole population, is divided into sections which are precluded by rules, prescribed by themselves, from all social intercourse with each other or with outsiders. The members of these sections may not eat, drink, smoke, or intermarry with any person outside the section to which they themselves belong. This is the Indian caste system.

The proposals I am to make, contemplate, to the largest possible extent, engaging the services of the caste authorities. The system is regarded very generally and by all Hindus as a purely religious institution. Nothing of course could give it greater importance in their estimation. I am proposing, however, to utilise it for a secular purpose, and I am concerned to prove, if I can, that I do not desire to make use of a purely religious creation for the object I have in view, but one which, though it has obtained the approval of the Hindu priesthood, has a primeval foundation quite independent of religion. If I am successful in my attempt, it will be an advantage to have the truth brought to light and to have a better knowledge of the subject I am to propose the authorities should handle. If I fail, I trust that I shall do no harm nor incur any umbrage at the hands of people, from the earliest times distinguished by their tolerance in matters relating to religion.

Let me first attempt to indicate some of the more important benefits the system secures for those who live under it. It undoubtedly gives great stability not only to the Hindu population but to the country as a whole, which must be affected by the staid character of the principal mass. It adds greatly to general contentment. Every one is pleased with and proud of his caste; no

one would part with it on any account. It may well be said that no man in any country has more friends in need than Indian castemen. All the men of the caste, it may be considered, are their brothers' keepers. This is a most important matter in a country, so widely extended and with such an immense population as India. But for the system the number of human waifs and strays, with none to help, would be endless. By the very name of his caste an Indian carries with him, as it were, a certificate of character and reputation of a certain value, wherever he goes. He needs no introduction, wherever there are caste brethren. He can depend on a hospitable reception. Caste people consider it a binding duty not only to provide for kinsmen and friends but for all brethren in distress. There has hitherto in India been no need for poor-laws or poor-houses. A member of a caste either has an hereditary occupation provided for him, or he may rely on full assistance from his brethren in finding proper employment. Also he will probably have a partner in life provided for him, before he arrives at years of discretion. If this has not been his lot, he knows the only quarter in which he is sure to find one, if he can only comply with the customary terms. Caste rules generally pay fair regard to good morals and some are specially designed to promote morality. So far there has been no allusion to matters relating to religion. The religious authorities have, I maintain, approved and embraced the caste system, as if it were a creation of their own, which is not the case, as I shall show.

My contention is that the system at the outset had had for its object the due adjustment of sexual relations, that the measures adopted with this view were found to promote economy, benevolence, and morality, and have accordingly been adopted by the Hindu religious authorities and been strengthened by religious ceremonial.

The basis and starting point of the whole system are obviously the fact that the community consists of sections, the members of which are under agreement to exchange brides with each other on certain customary conditions. These sections have not been formed by priests or rulers but solely by the agreement of the members among themselves, either subsisting from of old or varied from time to time by fresh consent. Priests and rulers, if they were ever so anxious, could not produce such associations. The need for brides was one that had to be met somehow, if the existence of

the community was to be continued. If we scan the benefits, which are derived from the caste system, as above set forth, we shall not find a single one, which would compel people to bestir themselves and take action to secure it, save this one. They were, however, obliged by necessity to undertake the solution of the problem—How to find brides when wanted ?

Among Dravidian tribes this problem of the adjustment of sex relations seems to have presented special difficulties. A number of these tribes, the Kandhs, Oraons, Mundas and Santals have remained outside Brahmanic influence, because they do not marry their girls until puberty and because a gross state of immorality prevails in these communities. Some of them, the Oraons for instance (Risley's " Tribes and Castes "), and the Kandhs (" The Indian Village Community," p. 172), have endeavoured to meet this evil by providing separate public dormitories for the young people. The general recourse to the practice of infant marriage even among the lower castes is generally attributed to a desire to protect the child wife from the stain of communism (Census Report, 1901, pp. 430-1). As an alternative to the caste system of providing brides by consent, we have the practices of infanticide and reliance on raiding and kidnapping to procure them (same Report, pp. 554-5)—hard straits to be driven to. The troubles which the adjustment of sex relations involved for the Dravidians were, however, far from ceasing when the Aryans took control. This is evident from the eight forms of marriage, graded to suit various classes and circumstances, as set forth in the Ordinances of Manu. It will be sufficient to note the seventh or Raksasa form, which was allowable for Khshatriyas only, that is, men accustomed to fighting and raiding. It contemplated (Book III. 33), " The forcible abduction from home of a maiden crying out and weeping after slaying and wounding the relatives and breaking in." Much allowance had evidently to be made for the " hardness of heart " of the men of those early times.

The restrictions as to eating, drinking and smoking only with people who can intermarry ought, it seems, to be regarded as merely subsidiary to the provision that all men must find their brides, each in that section of the population which has arranged for the mutual interchange. If eating and drinking and close companionship were under no restriction, there would be no adequate guarantee for female chastity or for the allotment of the proper bride to the

proper bridegroom. The complete segregation enforced no doubt also serves to strengthen the tie of caste and to endear the members, bound by it, to each other as compared with the rest of the population.

I have already expressed an opinion that the introduction of the system, if it did not in some cases precede, must have ensued on general recourse to husbandry and general residence in villages. If this occurred long before any irruption of Aryans into India (and I propose to prove that this was the case), then there must have been an aboriginal caste system in operation long before the Aryans made their appearance. The aborigines could not wait for its institution until the Aryans came and did them this service. The supply of suitable brides was not a matter that would brook any delay, and it was also a matter of high importance that public decency and at least fair morality should be maintained within the confined limits of the village site.

There were degrees of station in life in ancient times, as there are now. The lords of the village lands could not be expected to eat, drink, and intermarry with the labourers and menials who assisted in the cultivation of the soil and attended on their wants. This was duly provided for by the various castes or associations for the purpose, formed, we may suppose, in accordance with race, religion, kindred, occupation, neighbourhood, or any other tie that serves to bind men together. The arrangement served many other purposes and no doubt was all the more prized.

The maxim, "One man, one job," we may suppose to have been universally followed in ancient times, as it is at present. The village meets this requirement most conveniently by making it possible for one domestic menial in his special service or one craftsman to meet the needs of a number of families. We have here illustrations of the economic principles, co-operation and division of labour.

The confined space of the village is not, however, equally well calculated to satisfy some other human requirements. There are always the allurements of the tender passion to be guarded against. The caste taboo would be a fair protection against possible intrigues between members of the different castes represented in the village. Caste rules by enforcing child and early marriages might promote public morality, which was liable, we have seen, to suffer among the

aboriginal population, when marriage was deferred. Considering the loose, ill-regulated character of some of the tribes of the Dravidian population even at the present time, it is highly probable that such rules had to be resorted to at an early period by the people engaged in agriculture and living in villages. By marrying all the girls before puberty and forbidding remarriages, all operations inspired by the tender feeling with a view to later gratification became unnecessary and superfluous. Match-making would be entirely committed to the charge of older and wiser heads. This is the general result in Indian villages at the present day, and there is no evidence to show that the practice only began when the Aryans appeared or afterward.

Enough has already been said with regard to the benevolent effects of the caste system. In order that they might be secured in such an immense country, it was necessary that limits should be imposed on the numbers of any one association, otherwise the individual would become lost in the crowd. This was one reason why additional castes should continue to be formed, but from the accounts we have of the formation of new castes in the Census Report any whim, that an influential man may conceive, is regarded as a sufficient justification for a separation from any caste and the foundation of a new one.

Such or such like very nearly was the social framework which the Aryan immigrants, I contend, must have found in existence when they made their irruption into India and proceeded with their conquests. It is conjectured by scholars that they made their first appearance in India some time between 2000 and 1400 B.C. The correctness of the chronology is happily for our purpose of no importance. We happen to be able to tell how far the military conquest proceeded, and from what point a modified policy which respected land settlements was adopted. The Aryan conquest could only be regarded as at all complete for the area in which the joint village tenure is prevalent, that is to say for 218,170 square miles in the Panjab and United Provinces, as against 575,313 miles in the rest of India (exclusive of Burmah), where the raiyatwari tenure is prevalent (Baden Powell's "Indian Village Community," p. 8). The joint village tenure would arise out of lordship through conquest, which would give the territory conquered to the conquerors absolutely as a *res nullus*, consequent on the removal of the previous

occupants. The raiyatwari tenure, on the other hand, prevalent everywhere to the south of the Vindhya, also in Bengal and Sind, was exactly adapted to the case of an aboriginal, who was the first to clear the virgin forest off his holding and who had no interest in the adjoining waste or in the holdings of his neighbours, who had made similar clearances. Any one interested in the so-called Aryan conquest of the Dakkhan may possibly have his curiosity satisfied by referring to Appendix II., which contains Mr. Baden Powell's account of it, given, by the way, as outside the task on which he was engaged. Prior to the achievement of the Aryan military conquest, agriculture, residence in villages, and the unique social framework, which must be regarded as part and parcel of this stage of human progress in India, must all have been in operation for a very long time. The Aryans did not conquer these Provinces to get possession of mere wastes and forests, but chiefly for the sake of the cultivated lands, which they contained. Consequently they can lay no claim to the institution of the caste system, which must have already been in full operation for a period to which no limit can be assigned, before they appeared in India.

Indian caste has generally been regarded as a Hindu institution based on the Hindu creed and cosmogony, built up by exalting the priestly office and by declaring certain occupations, assumed to be hereditary, and certain foods, to be impure and polluted. This view was propounded by Sir Denzil Ibbetson in his Census Report of the Panjab (1881). Hindu writers are under a strong inducement, if not under religious constraint, to adopt some such theory in accordance with the myth of the Purusha Hymn, which divides mankind into four classes: 1. Brahmans, proceeding from the mouth of Purusha, a primary being, the source of the Universe. 2. Kshatriyas. 3. Vaisyas 4. Sudras, proceeding respectively from his arms, thighs and feet. Following the myth the Code of Manu prescribes the position and duties of these classes. This classification of Aryans with the Sudras or conquered races beneath them seems to come very far short of originating and establishing caste as a Hindu¹ institution. Clearly, however, the Brahman

¹ "I am aware," says Sir H. S. Maine, "that the popular impression here is that Indian society is divided, so to speak, into a number of horizontal strata, each representing a caste. This is an entire mistake. It is extremely doubtful whether the Brahmanical theory of caste upon caste was ever true, except of the two highest castes, and it is even likely that more importance has been attached to it in modern

22 INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION AND CASTE PROBLEMS

priests of the conquerors played an important part in confirming and establishing the system. They recognised it, most probably as they found it, as we shall see more particularly when we deal presently with the matter of Cow worship; they placed themselves and their nationals at the head of it; they thus crowned the edifice; they gave it a religious basis after a fashion. They, however, hedged themselves round by creating an imaginary barrier of religious pollution between the twice born and the conquered, who were excluded from all the religious rites and beliefs of the superior classes. It was made a crime to communicate any knowledge of the Vedas to Sudras.

A curious and interesting feature of the Hindu religion, which bears on the question of the origin of caste, is the sacred character of the cow. It is difficult to associate this cult with the highly spiritual character of the religion, which inspires the hymns, which the invading Aryans brought with them from beyond the Himalayas or which they were composing on the way. They arrived in India according to the hymns, as beefeaters,¹ and it seems quite impossible that they could have brought the cult of cow worship with them. On the other hand, it is not difficult to conceive how it should have been nurtured into existence by Dravidian civilisation on the plains of India. According to the foregoing argument it covered the peninsula all over with tribes subsisting under caste rules, as yet unaffected by Aryan influences. These tribes, to begin with, would be dependent on pasture, hunting and fishing, and the spontaneous produce of the fields and forests. When population exceeded the limits of these resources and tillage had been discovered, recourse was had to agriculture and there were insuperable reasons for village settlements. They enabled the people to live under protection, near to the fields in which they laboured, they made co-operation possible in many ways; life could be led in comfort in accordance with caste rules. At this stage the cow among animals would come into special prominence. She not only supplied

than ever was in ancient times. The real India contains one priestly caste, which in a certain, though a very limited sense is the highest of all, and there are besides some princely houses and a certain number of tribes, village communities and guilds, which still in our day advance a claim considered by many good authorities extremely doubtful to belong to the second or third of the castes recognised by the Brahmanical writers"—Maine's "Village Communities," p. 57

This was a very good measure of the Hindu claim to have originated caste, seeing that it was taken so long ago as 1871.—A H B

¹ See R. C. Dutt's "Civilisation in Ancient India," pp. 64, 65.

an important food, but she produced the bullocks indispensable for the tillage of the fields, for irrigation and for transport. The country is always liable to prolonged droughts, which have a most serious effect on the herds. In the drought of 1897-1900 it was found that in Northern India the destruction of the cattle from want of fodder varied from 17 to 90 per cent. ; in ancient times, with fewer wells, tanks, and canals, the result of such a drought would doubtless have been still more disastrous. Many animals have been pronounced sacred for very slender reasons, but under such circumstances it should be no matter for surprise that the deification of the cow suggested itself to an early religious people with numerous gods in their Pantheon. Such a device would not only gratify a probable religious conception, but might even be strongly advocated on grounds of public economy.

Some hints on this subject may be obtained from the remnants of Megasthenes' work, called "Indika," which have been preserved by various authors. Megasthenes was the ambassador of Seleukus Nikator, one of Alexander's successors at the Aryan Court of Chandragupta (Sandrakottos) about the year 300 B C. Diodorus, in his epitome of the "Indika," says that the whole agricultural class was sacred and inviolable, insomuch that they could carry on their operations in perfect security, while hostile armies were contending in their immediate neighbourhood. Neither side dared to molest or to damage agricultural property (MacCrindle, "Ancient India," p. 33). On the other hand, Strabo, giving an account of the philosophers, says that Brahmins eat flesh but not that of animals employed in labour (MacCrindle, p. 99). We may thus be able to see how the deification of kine, the chief instrument in use for agricultural operations, in course of time emerged as the sole result representing their at one time inviolable character. This character was, however, clearly an aboriginal feature, which the Aryan conquerors must have found it incumbent on them to accept, although it must have been very disagreeable to them to be deprived of a food they had been accustomed to use. By their altered policy they respected also the rayatwari land tenures. Under these circumstances it is a legitimate conclusion, it is submitted, that they accepted the caste system as they found it without contention, only bringing their own contribution to the rules, whereby they put themselves at the head of the system, protected from pollution

from the aboriginals. In caste we are therefore dealing with a primeval institution prior to the Aryan conquest.

The Census Commissioner has in his report accumulated from all sources an immense amount of most interesting information with regard to caste, but it has not enabled him to formulate any theory of its genesis. His conclusion is, that the question of origin is an insoluble problem. This pronouncement is unsupported by any argument intended to prove that the system of caste must be an inscrutable mystery, which human capacity must fail to fathom. Having done my best, I must indulge the hope that the foregoing discussion will be found to contain a fairly adequate, or even a complete explanation of the basis of the Hindu social framework, except perhaps by those who feel compelled on religious grounds to adhere to a different view.

We have just seen above that in the time of Chandragupta the agricultural industry held a highly privileged position, was in fact sacred. It was exempt from military duty. It formed the largest class of the population, the military class coming next in number. There were numerous tribes dispersed over the land, no less than one hundred and eighteen according to Arrian's account, taken from Megasthenes (MacCrindle, p. 198). Wide as India is, there could not have been so many tribes, more or less independent, coexisting without warfare from time to time, if it were not almost continuous. Governments throughout the Indian territories, engaged in war with each other, would carry on their operations, each with the handicap that the bulk of the population might be indifferent or even adverse to their proceedings. The feelings of the peasant population would have to be studied by all Governments; it would thus gain a voice in the settlement of the country, it might in fact become an *imperium in imperio*. This position of affairs might very well have led to a general understanding among all the peoples and states, that whoever might be the winner in any particular contest, he should only expect to realise from village communities a certain customary share of the produce, such as was provided by the raiyatwari tenure. It is probable that the singular system of land taxation, to which reference has been repeatedly made, was in this way confirmed and finally established.

The Aryan military conquest and the settlement of an Aryan population appear to have stopped short in the territory of the

United Provinces. Nevertheless the whole of the Bengal came under the dominion of Aryan Princes. Any further conquest, however, whether in the east or the south, would appear to have borne a political character, and to have only to a very small extent affected the original settlement of the land, seeing that the raiyatwari tenure in these parts remained undisturbed and the Aryan population introduced was insignificant. Apart from the conquests of Chandragupta and Asoka Aryan influence in the South appears to have depended for its extension on a propaganda by Brahman hermits and Hindu political and military adventurers (Appendix II.). Very probably in imitation of this propaganda, a rival one was begun which resulted in a most interesting experiment, made by an ancient Indian Government in direct moral teaching. It began in the third century before our era. The great prophet, the Buddha, was born in Mid-India to the south of Nepal about 568 B.C., and he is supposed to have died about 488 B.C. He continued for forty-five years preaching a new doctrine, which contained no reference to any Supreme Being or to the human soul; his operations were confined to a circle not more than 250 miles from Benares. The subject he ever discussed was the Eightfold Path in its various aspects, eight in number, Right Views, Right Aspirations, Right Speech, and so forth. He and his followers no doubt made numerous converts in the two centuries preceding the age of the great Indian Emperor Asoka, grandson of Chandragupta, who reigned at Patna from about 264 to 227 B.C. Early in his reign Asoka became a convert and made it his imperial task to propagate this philosophic faith by inscriptions on religious subjects, engraved in caves and on stone pillars, raised all over India, by digging wells, building monasteries, and sending forth missionaries. There was no persecution. The age was one of toleration, like the age of Constantine after he embraced Christianity. The new faith spread into China and Japan by way of Burmah. It is now followed by 35 per cent. of the world's inhabitants. Doubtless its propagation in India was greatly furthered by the imperial fosterage of Asoka. The Hindu religion did not suffer complete eclipse in consequence of the advance of Buddhism. Two pious Chinese travellers, one at the beginning of the fifth century and another in the first half of the sixth century of our era, found Brahman priests equally honoured with Buddhist monks, and both religions eagerly competing for the favour of the

people. After the latter date the Brahmans gradually got the upper hand, and by the end of the eleventh century the Buddhist religion had disappeared from the territories at present under the Government of India save Burmah and outlying places in the Himalaya and Orissa. One notable difference between the rival propaganda was that, while the Brahmans had adopted the caste system and made it their own, the Buddhists did not recognise it or lend it any countenance. This was doubtless one potent reason why the Buddhists ultimately failed to maintain their position in India.

This account of the caste system should serve to explain, why an Indian considers his caste as the thing of all things to him of the most importance. Any lively fear of interference with it will arouse him without hesitation and without waiting to count the cost, to take the most desperate measures. The Indian Army has furnished two standing illustrations of this condition of affairs, which though well known, is always liable to be lost sight of through inadvertence or ignorance of matters, to all outward appearance of no serious consequence.

The first instance is the Mutiny of Vellore in 1806, when the Indian soldiers at that station without warning attacked the European troops and set about massacring officers. On investigation it was discovered that owing to new military regulations, prescribing some changes with regard to dress and the display of caste marks, the Indian soldiers had caught hold of a suspicion that there was a design on the part of Government to destroy their caste and to make Christians of them.

The second instance was the great Mutiny of 1857, which involved the mass of the Bengal Native Army. The European forces had been recently greatly reduced in numbers. The privileges of the native soldiers had become very less tempting than in previous generations, there were also various special causes of discontent. Rebellion was set ablaze by the issue of greased cartridges for a new rifle, which had to be bitten by the soldier. Through a careless mistake in the arsenal, owing to which no care was taken to avoid the use of the fats of kine and swine in the manufacture, both Hindu and Muslim soldiers were grievously offended. A conflagration was caused which for a time placed British rule in peril.

In the foregoing discussion of the caste system I have devoted much consideration to a series of elements, which, like it, are peculiarly Indian; I have contended that they all hang together. I have also attempted to utilise data furnished by the Revenue Administration to throw light on the origin of the system. Previous speculation on the subject, so far as I am aware, had overlooked both these sources of information. A suspicion that there may be something in the conclusion arrived at is, however, to be found in the article, *Hinduism* (*Encyclopæd. Brit.*, p. 503), where the writer says: "At the same time one could more easily understand how such a system could have found general acceptance all over the Dravidian region of Southern India, with its merest sprinkling of Aryan blood, if it were possible to assume that class arrangements of a similar kind must have already been prevalent among the aboriginal tribes prior to the advent of the Aryan." Castes and caste divisions are, according to the foregoing argument, to be regarded in their origin and at the outset merely as connubial associations of spontaneous popular growth, necessitated by the peculiar conditions of Indian life, as above set forth. If my conclusions be correct they go to enhance the importance of caste as a primeval element of Indian existence. If the argument be at fault, and if caste be from the foundation upwards a Hindu religious institution and not, as is maintained, one in full vigour adopted and crowned by Hindus, it will not in any way very seriously affect the solution, I am to propose, of the problem in hand. The province of ethics must obviously lie in close proximity to that of caste, for they are both devoted to the regulation of human conduct; indeed they may be to some extent overlapping, for the brotherhood sometimes pronounce excommunication for serious criminal offences as well as for infringement of caste rules (*Encyclopæd. Brit.*, *Caste*). For this and for many other reasons it would appear advisable not to sanction any measures for moral instruction without careful consideration of their bearing on caste and consultation of caste authorities.

Many expositions of Indian caste appear to me to have been marred by combining an account of it with that of the Hindu religion, as if the two subjects were indissolubly connected. To me they appear as distinct as it is possible for one thing to be from another, especially where that other is the all-embracing theme of

28 INDIAN MORAL INSTRUCTION AND CASTE PROBLEMS

religion. Caste is the social framework, which enables a man to know where his place in society is, with whom he may associate, eat, and drink, and especially whom he may marry. He might as well try to escape from under the sky as from religion, but obviously no religion in particular has any special hold over any of these matters.

That this is a correct statement of the case seems also evident from the fact that converts to Islam often continue to adhere to their caste systems (Report, Census of India, 1901, p. 543). It is also a fact that Pope Gregory XV. published a bull sanctioning caste regulations in the Christian churches of India (Encyclopæd. Brit., Caste). It could hardly be otherwise, seeing that the theory of caste is that all rules and customs are adopted by the communities themselves, and are not derived from any outside authority, while the brotherhood preside over their application.

In the course of the discussion I have hardly taken exception to anything connected with the caste system. It is a human institution, doubtless not free from defect and quite capable of being improved. Even Hindu writers have faults to find with it. The artificial plan of life which strikes out the age of—

“The lover
Sighing like furnace, with a woful ballad
Made to his mistress' eyebrow”

inspires men of the West with distrust. The unnecessary multiplication of castes seems to be an evil. The system seems to be essentially unfavourable to the development of desirable political cohesion. The Hindu population immensely preponderates. No country seems more admirably suited for control by a single powerful Government than India, yet there has been none such by Hindus for more than two millennia, that is since Asoka. India, however, from the standpoint of early advancement in morals and humanity must be regarded as taking a very high place among the nations of the world. In the West slavery has only been abolished within the memory of men now living as the result of a tremendous war. In ancient times its recognition and practice were all but universal; even the Christian religion appears to have accepted it as a matter of course without any demur. The single bright exception to the universal rule was the Indian Empire of Asoka, in which it appears, according to Megasthenes, to have been prohibited. Mutual toleration

in religious matters was only permanently secured, anywhere in the West, some 230 years ago. On the other hand, it has always been the practice in India, so far as Hindus were concerned. India devised and sent out missionaries for two great religions, which now include within their fold some 48 per cent. of mankind. Any Western thinker, even if he were not handicapped by defective insight into Indian social relations, would have immense hardihood if he presumed to suggest to Indians how their unique social framework could be reformed and improved. Indians themselves, who have the deepest interest in the matter, should be by far the most competent to devise and execute, whatever may be desirable and possible in this field of achievement.

The last subject to be considered under this head is religion. India is a country of many religions. The Hindu religion is followed by two-thirds of the population. It has existed in India for some 3500 years, we may say. During that time it has had many vicissitudes. It must be admitted that it is a very difficult subject to handle. If our business with it could be satisfactorily adjusted, there would be little reason to fear that suitable arrangements could not be made in respect of all the other religions.

The Hindu religion seems to be chiefly concerned with the solution of problems, which deal with God, Soul, Matter, Nature, and Existence in its various aspects. In attempting to make some ethical provision for the wants of children and young people it will appear that we must have recourse to the assistance of religion. In the execution of this task, it is submitted, it would be quite out of place to attempt to present to them any of the great arguments just adverted to. Like ethics law is to a certain extent dependent on religion. The Hindus have been provided with a body of law suitable to their wants; the preparation of a collection of moral precepts, current in the various communities, and of the religious precepts there enforcing them, seems in like manner to be by no means too ambitious a proposal. This salt of the earth cannot be presumed to be absent from those decent, reputable, charming village communities, which are to be found all over the land, otherwise they could not be what they are. It only requires to be gathered and applied systematically, especially to the case of those young persons, who obtain the higher education and are more liable to sad aberration, in order not merely to maintain the fair

moral standard at present existing but even perhaps greatly to improve it.

There is in Vedānta treatises little to be found perhaps, that would suit our purpose. We could not tolerate obscure pronouncements, calculated to puzzle even philosophers, nor could we put up with obvious inconsistencies, much less with clear contradictions, admitted with all candour. To illustrate my meaning I will cite a few instances. The introductory stanza to the treatise *Vedānta-sāra* is as follows :—

“To the Self-existent, intelligence, bliss, impartite, beyond the range of speech and thought, the substrata of all, I resort for the attainment of the desired thing” (that is emancipation).

It seems obvious that very careful spiritual guidance would be required in order not to fathom a thing so deep but to get some slight notion of what is intended. Further on we are told something about “ignorance”

“Ignorance they (The Vedas perhaps ?) say is something not describable as existent or non-existent, an entity, composed of the three qualities, antagonistic to knowledge.”

The “ignorance” referred to, the commentator tells us, is another word for “illusion” or *māyā*, according to the doctrine, alleged to be revelation, that our senses deceive us, and that the pictures of the Universe with which they present us perpetually are mere illusion.

Even revelation will hardly enable mortals to put up with obvious contradictories and to make use of them for the purposes of practical life. It may be all very well for the purely religious or the philosophic sphere, but our task is to make provision for youthful minds, and we must not overtax them. In the religious aid provided for moral instruction there must be moderation, such as we find displayed in the precepts bearing on law. As an illustration I would quote from *Manu* VIII., 85, the fine reference to conscience as follows :—

“The wicked have said in their hearts, ‘None sees us.’ But the gods see them and so does the spirit in their own breasts.” This or the like could readily be appreciated by the youthful intelligence.

Even if this point were gained, perhaps all difficulty would not have been surmounted as regards Hindus. The policy of the Indo-Aryans not only aimed at keeping the aboriginal races apart from social intercourse with themselves but it debarred the former from

all participation in the religious convictions of the twiceborn. Any attempt to teach a Sudra the Veda, that is to say religion, was regarded as an unpardonable offence. It must be admitted that in this quarter there possibly lies in store a very serious obstacle to be surmounted. Whether it be important or of no account, can only be decided, when the problem is tackled in earnest. A learned Brahman friend informs me that the idea of refusing all religious knowledge to low caste communities is now quite obsolete. It is to be hoped that this information may prove correct.

Before parting with the subject of religion we may profitably inquire, why the susceptibility to evil effects for religion is confined to Hindu students and does not affect Muhammadans. What I have to say on this topic is not addressed to any save those who, like myself, accept with fullest conviction that ancient precept, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," which was later on confirmed by its adoption by the Founder of Christianity on a memorable occasion. Notwithstanding, I do not say that public secular instruction may not in some cases prove adequate. Religious instruction, like secular, may be imparted either publicly or privately. It appears an absolute essential, however it may be got, and that is well illustrated by the two very interesting cases we are considering. The Muslims have a religion, which they sincerely believe and steadily practise; which they cannot cease to practise with impunity at the hands of their co-religionists. They have been very chary of subjecting their children to the risk of contagion in our schools, and they often delay their public secular education for years, in order that their religious instruction may be first attended to by private tuition or in their own maktabas (schools), thus handicapping them to some extent in the battle of life. In a community of this character public instruction may be secular without pernicious consequences. This is how Muhammadan students maintain their moral balance and continue loyal and well behaved.

It is altogether different with the Hindu. His peculiarities are extreme receptivity and toleration of dogmas and extreme religious sensibility. If any people may live without God in the world, it certainly is not the Hindus. The Hindu Pantheon contains divinities innumerable. Every object in Heaven or on earth, "everything good or evil, great or useful, strange or

monstrous," has divine significance attributed to it and moves to awe and reverence the ordinary Hindu. All rivers are more or less sacred, the most sacred being the Ganges and six others, and a favourite pilgrimage is the perambulation of their sources. There are endless holy places, and pilgrimages to them are one of the settled occupations as well as one of the usual diversions of Hindu existence. Again, as to toleration, a Hindu, we are informed, is not a man who believes Brahmanical or any other doctrine. In fact a Hindu may even adopt Muhammadan or Christian doctrines, like Rammohan Roy, and still remain a Hindu. A Hindu is a man who belongs to a hierarchy of caste, headed by Brahmins, and who yields obedience to the rules of his own caste. These rules, at any rate in the case of the higher castes, involve an interminable array of prescribed rites and ordinances for every day of his life, and still more injunctions for special days and special occasions, too tedious to contemplate. In the ordinary course the whole life of a Hindu is regulated by tradition, understood to have been received from inspired sages. The Higher Education, which directs his attention to a foreign literature and a history, of anything but a sedative character; to Science, which proceeds by observation and experiment and reasoning thereon grounded, and which can show wonderful results; to Philosophy, by which everything in heaven and earth is open to doubt and question, is the very antithesis¹ of his former habits. The student naturally applies the new method to these traditions and to the ways and habits of his environment. He may find that they rest on no sound foundation and he is liable to despise and reject them. He may thus, losing his moral balance, be cut adrift from his moorings and be launched without compass or pilot on the ocean of life and so incur shipwreck; in fact he too often becomes an anarchist.

Preliminary topics having now been disposed of, the operations of the Indian Government in the Department of Education from the outset will next be set forth and discussed.

¹ "Now," says Sir H. S. Maine, "not only is all Oriental thought and literature embarrassed in all its walks by a weight of false physics, which at once gives a great advantage to all competing forms of knowledge, but it has a special difficulty in retaining its old interest. It is elaborately inaccurate, it is supremely and deliberately careless of all precision in magnitude, number and time. But to a very quick and subtle-minded people, which has hitherto been denied any mental food but this, mere accuracy of thought is by itself an intellectual luxury of the very highest order." Maine's "Village Communities," p. 26.

CHAPTER III

OPERATIONS OF THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

IN former ages the instruction of the population was left to the care of the people themselves and to churches and religious communities; the latter had traditions to hand down and required literary aid for the purpose. The education of the masses was not regarded as work in which Governments were under any obligation to participate; any interference on their part would rather be deemed a trespass on Church privileges. The first grant by Parliament for public education in England was made in 1832; it was confined to the erection of school buildings through certain societies. Annual grants followed. An Act was passed in 1870 to provide a scheme for universal elementary instruction. It contained provisions which enabled parents who objected to any religious instruction given, to withdraw their children from it.

Scotland was an early exception to the general rule, which governed Government action. As long ago as 1696 the Scots Parliament, in accordance with John Knox's advocacy in "The First Book of Discipline" (published in 1560), passed an Act providing for the maintenance of an elementary school in every parish by the Church and land proprietors. This arrangement lasted until 1872, when it was replaced by School Boards, appointed by popular election and supported by rates and other resources. If these facts be considered, Government public education may be regarded as having had a comparatively early beginning in India, if only on a very limited scale.

When the East India Company merely owned factories under the rule of Native Governments, it provided itself with powers to send out missionaries and schoolmasters to instruct and Christianise the people. When, after the battle of Plassy, the Company itself became a Government, it took a very different view of such enterprises. It was determined that no action of this nature, calculated

to excite or alarm natives as to its intentions, should be undertaken. Proposals entered in framing the Charter of 1793, to encourage missionaries and schoolmasters, were expunged at the instance of the India House, as "positively dangerous and absurd." They were revived twenty years later, when the Charter of 1813 was under discussion and carried after the most acrimonious debate. A clause was inserted in the Act, providing that, out of any surplus of the rents, revenues, and profits, after defraying all civil and military charges, "a sum of not less than one lakh of rupees (£10,000) in each year shall be set apart and applied to the revival and improvement of literature and the encouragement of the learned natives of India, and for the introduction and promotion of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories of India." Thus was laid the foundation of the present system of education in India, but the Charter was allowed to expire in 1833 before any real start was made with the superstructure.

There were many reasons for this delay. No special department was provided for executing the task. "The Government was then engaged in the war with Nepal and subsequently in tranquillising Central India" (Howell, "Education in British India," p. 7). Moreover, no one knew from experience, what means should be adopted for operations so novel as the promoting of a knowledge of English literature and modern science among the natives of India, if that was really what was intended, and this was warmly debated for twenty-two years. A despatch of the Court of Directors of 3rd June, 1814, seemed to recommend ancient studies in ethics, law, medicine, algebra and astronomy, to be found in Sanskrit works, and it offered various suggestions for proceeding on these lines. No steps were actually taken to carry out the Education clause of the Charter until 1823, when a General Committee of Public Instruction was appointed, to advise Government with regard to the state of Education in Bengal, and to make suggestions with a view to communicating to the people useful knowledge along with the sciences and arts of Europe, and to improving their moral character (Howell, p. 13).

This honorary Committee consisted of distinguished gentlemen, most of them members of the Civil Service. They had committed to them the entire Government business of education, including the Arabic College at Calcutta, the Hindu College at Benares and

the expenditure of the grant of a lakh of rupees under the Charter of 1813. The Arabic College was founded by Warren Hastings in 1781, to give instruction in the principles and practice of Muhammadan law. It was taken over by the Government, which gave a grant of Rs. 30,000 per annum for its support. The Benares College was projected in 1791 by Mr. Jonathan Edwards, who was then Resident there, in order "to endear our Government to the native Hindus by our exceeding in our attention to them and their systems the care ever shown by their own native princes." The Government granted Rs. 20,000 per annum for its support.

Under the operations of the Committee, the Sanskrit College was opened at Calcutta in 1824. The College at Delhi was instituted in 1825 for instruction in Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit. A school was opened at Allahabad in 1834, and encouragement was given to private schools at Bhagalpur, Sāgar, Midnapore and elsewhere.

The Court of Directors in a notable Despatch of 18th February, 1824 (said to have been drafted by Mr. James Mill), severely criticised the Committee's methods of encouraging literature and useful knowledge and teaching the sciences, as exemplified in the Calcutta and the Benares College, while the Committee strongly maintained its own views in its reply dated 18th August, 1824. It is there alleged that the natives, both learned and unlearned, "hold European literature and science in very slight estimation" and that there was no likelihood of an early change of view. The Court of Directors appear to have accepted this view, for in a Despatch of 5th September, 1827, they only advised keeping utility steadily in view, and not advancing faster "than a regard to the feelings of the Natives will prescribe." By the 29th September, 1830, the Court appears to have been again moved by the spirit displayed in 1824, for in a despatch of that date they strongly urged the importance of a thorough knowledge of the English language for enabling natives to appreciate European literature and to translate scientific works into the native languages.

The Committee issued its first report in December 1831. It seems not unreasonable to harbour a suspicion that the issue of a first report even at this late date and also its character were in great measure due to the arrival in Calcutta in the preceding year of a Scotch Missionary, and to his achievements in education, of which an account will be given by and by. The report showed

fourteen institutions under their control with 3490 pupils, of whom 240 were shown as studying in the English Department. The total income is given as Rs. 275,047 and the total expenditure as Rs. 263,994, of which Rs. 228,994 was spent on education, Rs. 15,000 on printing ancient classics, and Rs. 20,000 on office and miscellaneous expenses. It is noted that the bulk of the students under oriental teaching receive stipends of Rs. 5 and Rs. 8 per mensem, while the bulk of the students of English and Vernacular are charged fees. With regard to measures taken for the diffusion of English, it is said : "The consequence has surpassed expectation—a command of the English language, and a familiarity with its literature and science have been acquired to an extent rarely equalled by any schools in Europe. . . . The moral effect has been equally remarkable, and an impatience of the restrictions of Hinduism and a disregard of its ceremonies are openly avowed by many young men of respectable birth and talents." There is much besides in the same strain. Many things went to show that the attitude of the natives to learning English and to the instruction obtainable in that language was in a state of rapid change. Nevertheless the ten members of the Committee were in a state of stalemate for three years before the close of 1834 ; half were Anglicists and half were Orientals ; all progress was prevented. At this date a scheme for a college at Agra came on for consideration. Half the members proposed to teach Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit, the other half proposed to teach English and the Vernacular with just enough of the learned languages to satisfy local prejudices.

It was felt that for the sake of the Committee's own credit this state of affairs could be tolerated no longer and that a decision one way or the other must be come to. An essential key to such a decision was the discovery of an effective method for the communication of Western enlightenment and science to the native population. There had been ineffectual groping for a weapon to solve the enigma for twenty years or more ; the situation might well be compared to the present quest for a suitable method of imparting moral instruction. It was believed all over Calcutta and further afield, that the path to progress was no longer a mystery. It was accordingly determined at all hazards to bring the question of policy to an issue. Let us see how this was brought about.

There was no longer any prohibition to sending out Missionaries

to India. They could come to Calcutta and were not obliged to find a refuge in the Dutch Settlement at Chinsurah or with the Danes at Serampore, as had been the case with Carey. The Church of Scotland had established a Mission at Calcutta in 1824, to which it sent out the Rev. Alexander Duff, who arrived at the end of May, 1830. He had earned the highest honours in his University of St. Andrews. He was an excellent debater and preacher. His energy was inexhaustible. In those days missionaries seem to have been as much to seek in the matter of methods of evangelising as Statesmen in regard to communicating the enlightenment of the West. They each had a chapel and a small vernacular school near their residence. It was a hard task to secure any attendance at the chapel; the Missionaries devoted themselves to preaching in the bazaars, or wherever there was a crowd to be found; the crowd was either quite casual, or at any rate it had not assembled to listen to gospel teaching. The missionaries hardly made any converts. Some at the end of a long career were candid enough to admit, that they did not believe that they had succeeded in making a single convert. Duff's first work for a month and a half, from early morn to late at night, was to visit every mission chapel and every mission school all round Calcutta, to get some insight into the task before him. He was at the same time hard at work acquiring the vernacular. He came to the conclusion that his method of evangelising must be different from that of all his predecessors. They might be content with securing from the mass of humanity a few precious souls after a severe struggle, but he was to devote all his strength "to the preparing of a mine and the setting of a train which shall one day explode and tear up the whole from its lowest depths" ("Life," Vol. I., p. 109). His scheme was one of instruction through the medium of the English language.

According to his school scheme he was to begin the day with prayer, and the reading of a portion of Scripture by every class sufficiently advanced to read. The Scripture was expounded to those who could not read, with a view to rousing the intelligence, moving the heart and quickening the conscience. Having thus put religion in front, his plan was to teach every variety of useful knowledge, first in elementary forms and then, as progress was made in study, to embrace ultimately all the subjects taught in the higher schools and colleges of Europe. At the outset only pupils with a knowledge

of the vernacular were admitted ; an elementary vernacular school was added later on.

The beginning of operations involved severe labour. Duff, with the assistance of a Eurasian lad, was occupied for six hours a day, teaching some 300 Bengali youths the English alphabet and lessons in advance. He was further at the same time preparing a series of graduated school books which held their place in Bengal for a generation. The books were drawn up on a system, which provided ordinary instruction in reading and grammar and at the same time furnished useful and interesting knowledge of moral and religious subjects, calculated to train the heart and conscience. Long before this stage was reached there had been an opening day, which involved the collection of a few Bengali youths through the kind assistance of friends, among whom was Raja Rammohun Roy. He attended the opening in order to explain matters, and especially to remove the prejudice against reading the Bible. After the Missionary had said the Lord's Prayer slowly in Bengali, he requested some of the lads to begin the reading of the Scripture lesson. They demurred and one of them protested that this was the Christian Shaster ; they could not read it ; they would be made Christians and driven out of caste. The Raja intervened, saying that he had read all the Christian Shasters, as certain Englishmen had read the Hindu Shasters and yet, as they knew, he was a Hindu all the same and no Christian. After this and other like comments they were or seemed satisfied and the opening was accomplished. Months passed with an ever-increasing attendance. Duff was hard at work with his own Bengali studies. The school was acquiring a great repute in the City and its master much respect and affection.

After a year Duff, to show what had been done in the time, thought proper to announce a public examination of his pupils in the Freemasons' Hall, at which to give an air of respectability to the business the Archdeacon of Calcutta consented to preside. The pupils did their part admirably. They displayed a fair acquaintance with English, grammar, geography and arithmetic. Their ready answers to questions, their correct explanations and illustrations greatly surprised the spectators. Young Hindus were seen reading the Bible with ease and freedom ; they were even able to give correct answers with regard to the doctrines and principles of the

Christian faith and morals. A great impression was produced. There were reporters present; the business was for some time the talk of the town. The result was, that before long the system was introduced into most of the Mission and other schools in Calcutta and throughout Bengal. Also visitors from all parts of India took away with them its principles and methods, and put them in operation in schools elsewhere. In the second year after opening of Duff's Mission school hundreds of pupils had to be refused for want of accommodation.

The Missionary's success in starting his school and showing how English and general elementary instruction could be imparted to native pupils, doubtless gave him considerable prestige as an educator. Notwithstanding, in the three or four years which expired, before matters came to a crisis with the Committee of Public Instruction, it did not enable him to score any very notable success in Mission work. He was able to make four converts of some social distinction. Due notice was taken of these incidents by the Press, as they occurred, and they added to his repute.

In the middle of 1834 Mr. Thomas Babington Macaulay (afterwards Lord Macaulay), then in his thirty-fourth year, came out to India as Law Member of Council under the new Charter of 1833. He had been an eloquent supporter of the Reform Act, and had held the office of Secretary to the Indian Board of Control. He was appointed President of the Committee of Public Instruction, but he declined to assume office, until he should see what decision was arrived at on the question of policy. He wrote his famous Minute, as Law Member of the Governor-General's Council, on letters of the two parties in the Committee, submitting their respective cases to the Governor-General. Trevelyan, the Secretary of the Committee, who was then about to become Macaulay's brother-in-law, was well acquainted with Duff and warmly favoured his education projects.

This Minute, dated 2nd February, 1835, written in Macaulay's most brilliant style, makes out a seemingly overpowering case in favour of teaching English and modern science as against teaching Arabic and Sanskrit literature and the sciences therein to be found. His contention was, that the Act of Parliament of 1813 and the Charter refrained from specifying what languages and sciences were to be studied, and that the Indian Government in making prov

for the enlightenment of the Indian masses had perfect liberty to decide whether oriental languages, literature and science, or English and Western science should be studied in Indian Schools and Colleges. Doubtless Macaulay succeeded in completely demonstrating his thesis in favour of the latter by a long series of unanswerable arguments, enforced by an unexampled wealth of telling illustrations. The results arrived at may best be set forth in his own summing up as follows : " To sum up what I have said, I think it clear that we are not fettered by the Act of Parliament of 1813 ; that we are not fettered by any pledge express or implied ; that we are free to employ our funds as we choose ; that we ought to employ them in teaching what is best worth knowing ; that English is better worth knowing than Sanskrit or Arabic , that neither as the languages of law, nor as the languages of religion, have the Sanskrit and Arabic any peculiar claim to our engagement ; that it is possible to make natives of this country thorough good English scholars and that to this end our efforts ought to be directed."

This conclusion may be accepted with some reservations by those who have profited from a knowledge of the course of events since Macaulay's time. Eighty years have passed since the Minute was written and the expectation, on which one argument was based, that law enacted by the legislature would be substituted for Hindu and Muhammadan law books, has not been realised. No one can foresee how long this state of affairs may continue. It is true there should be no claim in respect of religious books, because religion is properly outside the province of Government under a system of toleration, with no religion established by law,—a fact which should not have escaped Macaulay's notice. Further it may be observed, that the Act of Parliament and the Minute were not intended to operate in *pari materia*. The Act had for its object provision for the good government of India ; the Minute was restricted to the question of Education. The ancient languages of a country are the storehouses in which are stowed away the priceless records of the long forgotten life of its peoples. A great civilised Government should make it its business, even at some expense, to see that these records are preserved and that the knowledge necessary for their interpretation and use is not suffered to die out, but is kept in vigour from age to age. If Macaulay's arguments based on utility were fully enforced, this important matter might be lost sight of.

Further this import of English literature and of western science and their diffusion over a Sub-Continent with such wide and numerous differences of religion as prevail nowhere else ; this putting of new wine, so to speak—new to India to all intents and purposes—into the oldest bottles ; this introduction of spiritual exotics into a strange clime were worthy of at any rate a slight notice by way of warning in this elaborate, carefully prepared State paper, which was supposed to administer sage counsel to the Supreme Council of the State. On the contrary, it contains nothing of this nature, because Macaulay with an exaggerated belief in the great potency of these exotics in their new element thought it quite fair to allow them to exert all their harmful influence. The potency of this influence was then, it appears, to the Government a sealed book, which it has never yet been induced to open, to study and to make due allowance for as regards its injurious effect on Indian beliefs and morals.

In passing, it may be noted, that the Persian language has not even been mentioned in the Minute, although its introduction into a school at Agra was a principal cause of the reference. Macaulay, in some of his minutes for the Committee of Public Instruction, expressed a hearty wish that it might die out of the country. It was the language of the Courts of Law until Act XXVII. of 1837 enabled its being dispensed with for the vernacular languages. With its assistance anything might be translated into Hindustani, the *lingua franca* of India ; without its help this would be impossible. It contains lyric poetry, some of it of a high moral character, which it is believed is unsurpassed in any other language. Its literature is the Muhammadans' very own. The following is a quotation on the subject from a report about the Calcutta Madrasa :—

“The Muhammadan, who with only a trivial knowledge of Arabic, has in the Persian language a body of literature of his own, of which he is proud and justly proud, and for complete ignorance in which no foreign language and no scientific attainments would be a compensation in his own opinion or in that of his friends” (Howell, p. 53).

The elimination of Persian from Indian studies would, it appears, be a great mistake, as banishing some of the chiefest joys of existence for a large section of the population. It would render Muhammadans still more backward in the pursuit of education.

Also, there is no reference in the Minute to Duff's success in the teaching of English, although it would have completely clinched Macaulay's refutation of an argument, that it was difficult to impart to natives anything beyond a smattering of English. But for Duff's achievements it is highly probable that the Minute would never have been written. They made the Anglicist party sure of their ground, and encouraged them to press their contention to an issue. We may conclude with certainty that the omission to use a convincing argument was due to the fact, that it was too well known in Calcutta to require notice, and that it was considered sound policy to say as little as possible about Missionary enterprise. We are told in the Quinquennial Report, 1907-12, p. 5, that "the activities of Mission bodies caused great alarm to Government." It had always been rather nervous about Missionaries, although the natives did not appear to give themselves any trouble whatever about them. Now Duff's methods were being imitated by all the Missions and by others. A fresh field of great importance, to which the Government might lay claim, was being exploited with rivalry by agencies, which it might be difficult to control or keep within safe limits. Government was impelled not only by a regard for the public welfare, but also by a desire to maintain its own position and to avoid future trouble, at all hazards, to take an active part in the work of education on the new lines, which had just been discovered. Duff was doubtless guided to his success by two facts. In the first place he came from a country which had shown its appreciation of the importance of public education, by making fairly adequate provision for it a century and three-quarters before this was accomplished by the English Government. Secondly, Duff's family was bilingual; it was equally familiar with Gaelic and with English. "As a native of the Highlands," he says ("Life," I, 189), "I vividly realised the fact that the Gaelic language, though powerful for lyric and other poetry and for popular address, contained no works that could possibly meet the objects of a higher comprehensive education." Bengali was, he considered, on the same footing as Gaelic; it was then but a poor language, like English before Chaucer; its literature contained no works which dealt with any but the merest elements of any subject of study. He thought that in the course of a generation it might be sufficiently improved to make it a means of imparting Western enlightenment. Almost three generations have

already passed, and Indian Higher Education is still everywhere conducted in English.

I could easily have forgone most of the preceding comments on the Minute and dealt with it very briefly, and I should have much preferred this course, had it been possible. They may be regarded as a mere introduction to the sequel, with which I could not dispense. The Indian Government defines its policy with regard to religion as one of "complete neutrality in matters of religion." That definition was not devised by Macaulay, although he may be said to have laid the foundation of Indian Education by the Minute. Howell tells us, it was first declared in a Despatch of the Court of Directors, dated 7th September, 1808. In adopting it and professedly laying the utmost stress on it by pronouncing it sacred, he was merely obeying with zeal the orders of his Masters at the India House. On two occasions after the Minute was written, the Governor-General of the day, Lord William Bentinck, affirmed the policy as a solemn engagement. The same thing has been done by the authorities perhaps a hundred times since. It is still adhered to and announced on every suitable occasion, as if it were a thing about the absolute perfection of which there could be no doubt whatever. It is a very audacious and very painful proceeding on my part, for which, if in error, I hope I may be forgiven, when I venture to affirm that the definition leaves very much to be desired. With all submission the term "neutrality" appears most ambiguous, misleading, and futile. I propose to deal with the matter at length in the next section in connection with "toleration," and I am only anticipating now, while Macaulay's work is in hand, because, I maintain, he furnishes an incomparable illustration of the truth of my contention.

The Minute contains two passages dealing, incidentally merely, with the question of policy. It will suffice to quote one which runs thus—

"Assuredly it is the duty of the British Government to be not only tolerant but neutral on all religious questions. But to encourage the study of a literature admitted to be of small intrinsic value, only because that literature inculcates the most serious errors on the most important subjects, is a course hardly reconcilable with reason, with morality, or even with that very neutrality which ought, as we all agree, to be sacredly preserved. It is confessed

that a language is barren of useful knowledge. We are to teach it, because it is fruitful of monstrous superstitions. We are to teach false History, false Astronomy, false Medicine, because we find them in company with a false religion."

There is also a reference to "absurd theology" in the concluding paragraph.

I admit I am unable to follow with certainty the train of ideas pervading the quotation. I imagine that the word "tolerant," has no reference to the system of toleration, but merely means mild, kind, indulgent or the like. It indicates a positive quality, while neutral must be negative, whereas we should expect something more intense than tolerant, of a positive character. However, this may be allowed to pass. I would simply inquire whether the severe expressions which occur with regard to Indian religions would not be more fully in accord with the context, if hostile and hostility were substituted for neutral and neutrality? If I believed in magic I should say there must have been some magical power at work which rendered the attitudes of neutrality and hostility for Macaulay tenable together or exchangeable at pleasure.

The philosophy of "neutrality" is not quite so simple a matter as it looks; as I trust we shall find later on. It would have required some exact psychological analysis to determine what feelings were in accord with and what at variance with the attitude of neutrality. Now Macaulay was no speculative philosopher. "All philosophical speculation was alien to his mind," says Mark Pattison, in the article "Macaulay" in the *Encyclop. Britannica*. My conclusion is that Macaulay had no notion, approximately accurate, of the subject he was handling, viz. neutrality, and that for this reason he gave utterance to wild discordant words and thus went full tilt at Indian elemental sanctities. He was furnished with a wretched tool wherewithal to do his work, and it was bungled. What workman can do proper work without proper tools? It will be apparent, I trust, that I have no desire to assail a great man, but only to offer the best explanation of the case and the best excuse I can find for him.

Some two years after Macaulay, not in public but in the confidence of privacy, chose to appear among the prophets, and so it is further disclosed to posterity what wonderful notions he entertained about neutrality, if he really had any, and if it was not to him

merely a fetish. The following paragraph we find in a letter to Zachary Macaulay, his father, dated, Calcutta, October 12th, 1836:—

“ Our English schools are flourishing wonderfully. We find it difficult—indeed in some places impossible—to provide instruction for all who want it. At the single town of Hoogly, fourteen hundred boys are learning English. The effect of this education on the Hindus is prodigious. No Hindu who has received an English education, ever remains sincerely attached to his religion. Some continue to profess it as a matter of policy ; but many profess themselves pure Deists and some embrace Christianity. It is my firm belief that, if our plans of education are followed up, there will not be a single idolater among the respectable classes in Bengal thirty years hence. And this will be effected without any effort to proselytise ; merely by the natural operation of knowledge and reflection. I heartily rejoice in the prospect ” (“ Life,” by Trevelyan, p. 329).

We are here happily provided with Macaulay’s own explanation of the situation. This highly gifted, strangely erratic enthusiast had thus succeeded in conjuring up to himself a wonderful vision of the near religious future of Bengal, which magnified any real appearances perhaps a thousandfold. It is not to be imagined that any of his colleagues, much less the Government, had art or part in this work of the imagination, or that they would for a moment have borne with patience the description of a project, which belied their most solemn professions.

He thought it proper for the Government under the badge of neutrality to initiate operations, which he firmly believed would uproot the Hindu religion among the respectable classes in thirty years—always provided it did not have recourse to proselytism, but simply allowed the leaven of knowledge and reflection to operate in silence. Was not this so-called neutrality in reality merely a blind to cover a design to overthrow the Indian religions ? Yet I do not think for a moment that Macaulay is to be charged with hypocrisy, dishonesty or deceit. He thought, I believe, that he was playing a perfectly fair game. He only forgot that he was not in England but in India, although he had been there for more than two years. It takes a much longer time in most cases to realise a fact of this nature. In England a large majority believe that their religion is, as it were, the Rock of Ages, that it has stood the attacks

and shocks of numerous infidel philosophers, sceptics, scientists and the like, and it has not been one whit the worse for all their idle effusions. Moreover any creed, cult or religion which cannot bear treatment of this sort, they think, had better take itself away as speedily as possible and not cumber the ground. When arch offenders like those just mentioned are taken so lightheartedly, what folly would it be to make any pother about teaching English, simple science, sound literature? This was the innocent operation over which Macaulay was presiding. We may well understand that there was no shade of stain on his conscience. Macaulay, with all his talents, was, we have seen, no philosopher. He did not think things out. He was unable to calculate the effect of exotic sciences, literatures, and philosophies in new climes; he had no sound notion of their powers for good or evil. He did not appreciate the power of the English moral and religious atmosphere, in which he had always lived till latterly, with the immense apparatus of all the churches teaching the young, for warding off or palliating the possible evil effects of new doctrines and foreign philosophies.

Macaulay, a great man no doubt after all, it must be admitted, in this light cuts a very sorry figure. I have made the best defence for him I can, and I believe I am giving a correct explanation of his amazing conduct. According to my contention nothing better could be expected, seeing that his Government had handicapped him and itself by the evil guidance of a fatal policy, fit to deceive even the very elect.

Duff was absent from India by the time the Governor-General in Council passed the Resolution of 7th March, 1835, in favour of Macaulay's proposals. The former gave full expression to his opinions on the subject in the course of a very eloquent speech, delivered to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (May, 1835) "If in that land," he said, "you do give the people *knowledge* without religion, rest assured it is the gravest blunder, politically speaking, that ever was committed. Having free unrestricted access to the whole range of our English literature and science, they will despise and reject their own systems, they will undoubtedly become infidels in religion. And shaken out of the mechanical routine of their own religious observances, without moral principle to balance their thoughts or guide their movements, they will as certainly become discontented, restless agitators, ambitious of

power and official distinction, and possessed of the most disloyal sentiments towards that Government, which in their eyes has usurped all the authority that rightfully belonged to themselves."

Here we have, like Macaulay, another prophet in Duff; we may stop for a moment to compare the two performances on a subject in which they were very much interested. We may thank our stars that both are very wide of the mark, for they foretold effects, which must have resulted in cataclysms, if not the destruction of British power in India. As the population has greatly increased — in Bengal during the past eighty years, there are doubtless many more respectable Hindus, sound in the faith, in that country now, than there ever were in any previous age; whereas Macaulay would have had them all disappear in thirty years in consequence of the carrying out of his education scheme. Duff affirmed that all who received the Government education would become infidels and anarchists. Macaulay thought there would only be an undefined number of infidels, but he made no allowance for any anarchists. As a matter of fact there are a few—few, I say, in comparison with the population or the educated. Of course even a few are a great calamity; there ought to be none, and there will be none by and by, if there be fairly sensible administration. Both are alike prophets of evil and, as good luck would have it, equally bad prophets. The reason is that they could form no idea of the resistance to change of the caste system, if it only be not interfered with. A good many liberties may be taken with religion, but with caste none whatever.

Duff, in a pamphlet entitled "New Era of the English Language and Literature," extolled the Governor-General for the new departure but complained that he had not gone far enough. "We cannot but lament," he there says, "that no provision has been made for substituting the only true religion, Christianity, in place of the false religion, which our literature and science will inevitably demolish." The Missionary forgot that much had come and gone since the days of Theodosius, who had only to say the word in order to make all his subjects Christian converts; that business of that sort had now devolved on men like himself. Even Macaulay had very hazy notions on this important subject. In his essay on Mr. Gladstone's book, "The State in Relation with the Church" (1839), he gave expression to the opinion that the Government of India, while it ought indeed to propagate Christianity, should not attempt such

substitution of the true for the false, because it would inevitably destroy our Empire. This was truly a hard case to propound to a poor British public : a duty divided between piety and prudence or cowardice as we may choose to phrase it. There was of course no hard case save for those who had forgotten one of the chief lessons of English history, the system of mutual religious toleration.

The Resolution of the Governor-General in Council of the 7th March, 1835, determined that the great object of the British Government ought to be the promotion of European literature and science among the natives of India, and that all the funds appropriated for the purposes of education would be best employed on English education alone. It was declared, however, that there was no intention to abolish any school or college of Native learning, which was held in esteem by the native population, and that all vested interests, in appointments held, would be respected. The printing of Oriental works was ordered to be discontinued.

It may be observed that, apart from any schools in existence, no provision was made for any teaching of the vernacular whatever. However, the Committee knew that this was an oversight, and took care that no harm should come of it (Howell, p. 26). The amount at their disposal was a mere pittance, but they set to work with it, to establish schools for the teaching of English literature and science in the Presidencies of Fort William and Agra to the extent of their resources. The design was to enlighten a few through the medium of English, in the hope that they would shed their light on those under them, and thereby improve and enrich the vernacular languages. This mode of procedure was found to be erroneous. Steps had already been taken to procure information regarding the vernacular schools in existence throughout the country, and their improvement was taken into consideration. The accounts of Mr. Adam's work in Bengal and of Mr. Thomason's in the North-Western Provinces from 1845 onward to his death in 1853, are very interesting, but they have no bearing on the present task. In 1842 the business of the Committee of Public Instruction had greatly expanded ; it was spending 54 lakhs of rupees. It gave way in that year to a Council of Education in Bengal, which remained in office until superseded by a Director of Public Instruction under the Despatch of 1854. The management of Education in the North-Western Provinces was taken up by the new Government at Agra in 1843,

and held by it until provided for, as in Bengal, by a Director of Public Instruction and Inspectors under the same authority.

That Despatch reviewed the past progress of Education in India; it laid the foundation of a great system with great forethought and it sketched the superstructure in great detail with wonderful accuracy. A perusal of the last Quinquennial Report, which treats of the operations carried on within the edifice, enhances afresh any impression this masterly work may have previously produced. With its general contents we are not here concerned, we can accept, admire and be grateful for them. Its object is the diffusion of the improved arts, science, philosophy and literature of Europe, while recognising the importance of a study of the three oriental languages for historical and antiquarian purposes, for the study of law and for the refinement and improvement of the various vernaculars. The incompetence of the State in religious matters is fully recognised; while neutrality is professed again and again, no stones are cast at ancient beliefs.

"Finally," says the Quinquennial Report (p. 7), "with almost nervous exactitude, the relation of the Government was defined towards religious beliefs. In Government institutions, the education imparted was to be exclusively secular. The system of grants-in-aid was to be based on an entire abstinence from interference with the religious instruction conveyed in the school assisted. Inspectors were to take no notice whatever of the religious doctrines taught in aided institutions." This criticism would be quite correct, if we are to suppose that the Court of Directors sitting by the Thames had no notion that the mere teaching of Western science and philosophy to Indians was liable to have deleterious effects on religious beliefs—a fact so patent to Macaulay, which he may not have communicated to his superiors. The public came to know his opinion, when Dr. Duff's "Life" was published in 1879 or Macaulay's in 1909. As far as my very imperfect information serves, the Indian and the Home Governments had their official attention seriously drawn to this important matter for the first time by the careful discussion of it in Howell's Note of the year 1868, pp. 31–32 (Appendix I.). The Secretary of State, in his Despatch dated 28th October, 1868, said: "I have read with the greatest interest Mr. Howell's valuable Note." It does not appear that anything whatever followed on this perusal. Howell says that "It is probable that the evil is less serious in

primary schools where the instruction given does not necessarily destroy religious belief, whereas our higher instruction does." Now we know to our cost that the result is not only the destruction of religious beliefs but the training of a certain number of anarchists.

The great Despatch, which enters into many minute details of organisation, while rightly recognising religion as a matter entirely outside its sphere, although once and again the existence and high importance of morality are noted, yet has hardly a word to say about moral training. For meeting any possible want of this nature reliance seems to be placed on the mere training of the intelligence. In para. 3, "the encouragement of education" is referred to "as peculiarly important, because calculated not only to produce a higher degree of intellectual fitness but to raise the moral character of those who partake of its advantages." Further the ability and integrity of native judges is attributed to the progress of education amongst them, and (para. 77) "to their adoption along with it of that high moral tone which pervades the general literature of Europe." Assuming for the sake of argument the existence of "the high moral tone" here claimed, to what cause must it be ascribed? Must it not be set down to the single religion and the Christian ethics, which pervade the European continent? They are not maintained for nothing, but at the cost of infinite effort by churches and like institutions, bringing up the young in the way they should go. The Court of Directors had spent all its existence in this atmosphere and was apparently unconscious of its existence. Moreover, it has treated its *protégée*, India, to continued courses of spiritual exotics from the West without any care or precaution as to what might happen. It has made all advancement in life dependent on their appropriation and culture. We have heard of physical exotics, rabbits and briar rosebushes introduced into a Southern Continent, threatening to overrun it and entailing immense expenditure for subduing and extirpating them. The same rule applies, apparently, both to the physical and the spiritual world, seeing that we must suppose them both to proceed from the same origin, whatever it be. We have here in my humble opinion alighted on the grand defect of this Magna Charta, which does not recognise that special moral training for the young is a necessity, especially when they are subjected to the severe ordeals above mentioned. Such substitutes as may be available and likely to prove effectual,

must be found in order to produce something corresponding to the moral and religious atmosphere above suggested.

Looking at the question from the standpoint of the pupils, the Government scheme practically leaves both religion and morals out of account. On the other hand, if the young people have recourse to Mission schools, they have morals presented to them in alliance with a religion which is not theirs, which they could not adopt without incurring a species of martyrdom at the outset of their career, and the embracing of which by any considerable numbers would immediately result in the Mission schools being emptied. Having regard to all these uninviting risks and prospects we can well understand why in most provinces a good many indigenous schools should be able to maintain themselves while only supplying, we may say, a third-rate article, so far as secular instruction is concerned. Their distinctive character is religious; the secular teaching is generally confined to reading, writing, and arithmetic. The numbers attending these schools and the hard alternative presented to pupils attending all other schools are proper measures of the failure of the Indian system, to meet educational wants on just and humane terms. A policy of neutrality must be bound by the selfish interests of the neutral; justice and humanity should be quite outside its reckoning. The Government doubtless does itself a world of injustice by its avowed policy.

In 1882 the Government of India appointed a Commission of twenty gentlemen, representative of Indian Education experts, presided over by the Honourable W. W. Hunter, to inquire how effect had been given to the Despatch of 1854 and to make any suggestions it could *for more completely carrying out the policy prescribed, from which there was no intention to depart*. The Universities and the Province of Burma were excluded from the field of inquiry. Their report contains a well-considered review of all the education resources in operation at the time with the exceptions just noted. Recommendations for future action were made after examining two hundred witnesses from the various provinces. It will be observed that clear intimation was given at the outset that no discussion of the policy of the Despatch was desired. By clause 21, however, the Commission was at liberty to express opinion on any matter arising out of or cognate to the subjects referred to it. Our interest in the views of the Commission is of course restricted

to those which are concerned with morals and religion, but it is an immense advantage to have those views stated as part and parcel of the whole Indian system of education

For my purpose there is a very serious defect in the instructions issued to the Commission and in the Report in consequence. It may have been due to mere oversight. There was to be no inquiry regarding the policy of the Despatch of 1854, that is to say, about the expediency of neutrality in religious matters and other things, but that was no reason for excluding from the inquiry the question to what extent this neutrality had or had not been observed. It is very strange that this oversight should have occurred after Howell had almost gone out of his way for a couple of pages to draw attention to the fact that the higher instruction was destroying religious beliefs. This immense Report contains no information on this important point, which would seem to involve a most serious breach of the principle of neutrality and a very gross failure to observe the most solemn promises on this head contained in the Queen's Proclamation. In spite of everything the matter was broached before the Commission by several native witnesses in the Panjab (Report, p. 295), who contended that the principle of neutrality should be observed by giving equal facility for instruction in all religions. A long quotation is given from the evidence of one witness, showing the demoralising effect of State education which ends with the following sentences: "Will Government tolerate such a state of things? Will it still persist in a policy which excludes religion from the State education but encourages something which is anti-religious in the most indirect manner." It was a matter of the first importance to ascertain to what extent views and feelings of this nature were prevalent and what dimensions the evils depicted had then attained. The Commission without any hesitation declared that any scheme of the nature proposed was quite out of the question. They suggested the setting up of denominational colleges. The contention of the witnesses would appear to be admitted by the Commission to be well founded. The question is whether the objects aimed at can be adequately realised by any method, short of setting up separate colleges for each religion and each sect. The purport of these pages involves an affirmative answer.

The Commission freely discussed the expediency of permitting religious instruction in Government, Board, and Municipal Primary

schools under various circumstances and also in Government colleges. It recommended that the rules excluding religious teaching in Government schools should apply to all Primary Municipal and Board schools and that the rule against it in Government colleges should continue. So far as any proposals I have to suggest are concerned, I am in complete agreement. Of all Babels the religious one would be the least tolerable.

As regards moral training the Commission have what appear to be some excellent suggestions as to the training of teachers in Normal schools with a view to the maintenance of order and discipline ; concerning the effect of good manners on moral training ; with regard to the demeanour of teachers to their pupils and of the inspectors to the teachers, whose schools they inspect. They recommend that a special manual should be prepared for the guidance of masters. As regards Primary schools the Commission mention the subject of a moral text-book as being favoured by some, but they appear to have come to no conclusion. As to colleges, they propose that an attempt should be made to prepare a moral text-book, based upon the fundamental principles of natural religion, such as may be taught in all Government and non-Government colleges. I do not know whether anything was ever done to carry out this recommendation and whether there was any success. If nothing was done, I should say that in this Government displayed wisdom. The fundamental principles of natural religion might turn out as mythical and uncertain as any of the ancient traditions, and Government would find itself involved in endless religious hornet nests. Mr. Telang's Minute of dissent seems very able and very sound. He is quite clear " that our institutions for secular instruction should not be embarrassed by any meddling with religious instruction, for such meddling among other mischiefs will yield results which, on the religious side, will satisfy nobody and on the secular side will be distinctly retrograde." On the religious and political sides it appears to be a trifling with the system of toleration, which all those concerned with the Commission appear to have ignored. I am glad to find the Commission ready to go even one step with me, I may say, on the course I am to propose. I am to suggest a number of text-books, framed on a different plan, but not for Government or non-Government colleges.

Any proposed change should, it seems, keep in view not merely

present Indian Education resources, but their probable development with a view to their formation into a single all-embracing system. At the bottom there are the indigenous schools, at present outside all Government arrangements. It is desirable that conditions should be provided which would enable them, without sacrificing the objects which they serve, to range themselves within the Government and other Primary schools. Further it is desirable that the pupils of the latter belonging to various religious and social communities should, as a matter of course, receive such moral training as the great majority of them can accept, so far as this is possible, with due regard to the different creeds and sects represented in each locality. The need for any change as regards moral training in "Primary schools, where the instruction given does not necessarily destroy religious belief" (Howell, p 35), is much less urgent than in Secondary schools. The object of this work is to suggest an experiment with the Higher Education, which could be made at no great cost. If it were successful, the method could easily be modified, so as to adapt it to the Primary schools, but the expense would be serious. There would, however, be no risk of failure in their case after the prior success. They would then be in a position to absorb all or most of the indigenous schools and thereby complete the Indian system.

We may look at the task to be accomplished from a different side. Religious, moral, and intellectual training has to be provided for Indian youth. The possible agencies are: (1) Government; (2) Municipal and District Boards; and (3) Religious Denominations, including Missionaries, private persons. Government can, it will be shown, exercise no initiative in regard to religion, but the problem cannot be solved by the complete withdrawal of Government from the work of Education and the grant-in-aid system, because the same objection which debars Government from the initiative in regard to religion, applies also to the public Boards. Moral training, in order to be effectual, I am to show, requires the aid of religion. I am also to show that there is no objection to Government and the Board's obtaining this assistance from local religious communities, who are under no disability and would be glad to give it, on terms. Religious denominations, Missionaries, and private adventurers can do the necessary work in all three fields, but they are not available wherever required; if they were, no Government, it is believed,

could afford to be beholden to voluntary bodies for a service so important. This was a solution of the problem which Duff strongly advocated. He descried in it a grand opportunity for Missionary bodies throughout India stepping into the field, and thereby in a great measure monopolising the educational resources of the country for their own proselytising schemes.

This concludes our account of operations of the Indian Government relating to Education, so far as our subject is concerned. We shall next discuss the relations of the State to Religion from historical, philosophical, legal and special Indian standpoints with a view to deciding on a suitable definition of policy, should that prescribed be found inadequate or unacceptable.

CHAPTER IV

THE RELATION OF THE STATE TO RELIGION SUITABLY DEFINED

THE Government of India is being constantly urged to undertake in its schools the teaching of various religions for the sake of morality. It never misses an opportunity of declaring it impossible for it to entertain any such proposals. The subject, according to the opinion already expressed, can best be elucidated by sketching roughly the history of State interference from ancient times down to the present. This will, it is hoped, enable us to arrive at a sound conclusion, which we shall endeavour to define by correct and appropriate terms.

Around the shores of the Mediterranean the sphere of ancient civilisation in the West, some three thousand years ago, the religions of practically all the nations were Polytheisms of a kindred tolerant type. The divinities were all of a local character at the outset; they were supposed to exercise their functions with special power within certain limits. When new territories were conquered, the conquerors took in charge the local divinities along with the conquered people, and treated them as if they were their own gods; in particular, this was the practice of the Romans, who were very tolerant as regards religion. All the great gods of the Greeks had corresponding representatives in the Roman Pantheon owing to their kindred character. Moreover, at the beginning of our era, nearly all the cults of any importance throughout the Provinces found a place in the capital of the Empire. Religion was everywhere recognised as one of the chief functions of the State. The State or its officials determined the divinities to be worshipped, the ritual to be observed and the doctrines that might be professed. We know from the Psalmist (lxxi. 1), that even in the Monotheistic Hebrew State the fool might say there was no God, but that only

in his heart ; even he must not give such a thought public utterance.

In the small Greek communities the current myths had embalmed for each succeeding age all the notions permissible in history, philosophy and theology. The singer who chanted them was held to be inspired by the heavenly Muse and in consequence all his utterances were supposed to possess the virtue of reality, just as much as the incidents of everyday life. Any doubt on the subject laid the rash sceptic open to a charge of impiety. In the modern world we live under very different conditions and so we may find it well-nigh impossible to realise such a state of existence. Grote, the historian, however, a profound student of Greek literature, maintains that this account is no exaggeration, and he gives excellent reasons in support of his contention (Chap. XI). There were many Greek gods and many heroes, reputed to be their descendants. The citizens of each State accepted the prevailing creed as a matter of course ; they had a personal pride and interest in maintaining it, inasmuch as according to it, they were all of them descended from some one or other of these gods and heroes. It was their interest and duty each to uphold his own State. If war, famine, earthquake, pestilence and such like calamities were to be averted, it was deemed necessary that no cause of umbrage to the gods should go unpunished and unexpiated. With this view, and also no doubt sometimes to serve baser ends, impeachments for impiety were always liable to be laid against any one who ventured to propound any doctrine savouring of innovation in religion or calculated to offend jealous and powerful divinities. On such a charge Anaxagoras the philosopher was tried and, happily, acquitted. In a like case Socrates was convicted and sentenced to end his life by drinking hemlock. Aristotle, with a charge of this nature impending, went into exile from Athens and probably thereby escaped a similar fate.

At Rome under the Republic, the College of Pontiffs presided over by the Pontifex Maximus had the chief control in the department of religion, along with the preparation of the Calendar and the care of the ways and bridges, matters which involved a knowledge of numbers. In the year 46 B.C. Julius Cæsar, in pursuance of his Imperial policy of bringing the business of all the chief offices within his sole control, had himself elected Chief Pontiff. In that capacity

he gave the world the Julian Calendar. The office remained vested in his Imperial successors, who were thus enabled to deal with the State religion according to their pleasure. The God of the Christians was an exception to the rule, which bestowed the freedom of the City on the gods of mankind, because Christians could not refrain from manifesting their abhorrence of the worship of idols, which applied to all or most of the other divinities. Christians were accordingly on this account a sect by themselves and liable to be persecuted, whenever scapegoats were required to expiate the cause of any public calamity, such as the burning of Rome in Nero's time. There were persecutions under him and also in the reigns of Domitian, Severus, Diocletian and Maximin. The Christian status was completely changed by the edict of Milan of the Emperors Constantine and Licinius of the year 313 A.D., which gave to Christians and to others the absolute right to follow whatever religion commended itself to their choice. There was thus common toleration for every cult, until in 380 A.D. Theodosius the Great signified His Imperial pleasure that all his subjects of every nation should adhere "to the religion which was taught by Saint Peter to the Romans," assuming the title of Catholic Christians. Further, that all recusants should be called Heretics and expect to suffer, besides the Divine wrath, the severe penalties which he, guided by heavenly wisdom, might think proper to inflict on them. During the early centuries of our era a Christian Church, monastic in character, had been founded in Roman Britain and its bishops took part in the Councils of Arles 314 A.D., Nicæa 325, and Rimini 359, under the auspices of the Roman Empire. This Church practically disappeared with the fall of the Empire in the West. The conquest of England by Saxons, Angles and Jutes, who were heathens, drove Christians into Wales and remote parts of the island, insomuch that the Church had to be founded afresh, as it was by Pope Gregory and Saint Augustine. This Church had a chequered career during Anglo-Saxon times owing to differences between Rome and the local rulers. The Norman Conquest had the support of the Roman See, and the Church was reformed to meet the views of the Conquerors. In later centuries down to the reign of Henry VIII. there was considerable controversy from time to time between Rome and the English Government regarding Ecclesiastical affairs. Henry VIII. after being honoured with the title, "Defender of the Faith," for

writing a book against Luther in support of Papal authority, quarreled with the Pope and got Parliament to pass an Act, establishing the Royal Supremacy, which thus conferred on him with Parliament the position, as regards the Church, held by the Roman Emperors. The Supremacy was renounced by Queen Mary, who was a good Catholic, but was restored by Queen Elizabeth, from whom it has been handed down to the present time, but changed by the way. More than half the history of England during the reign of Henry VIII. and down to the Revolution of 1668 may be set down to dealing with the Church and its affairs. The State control of worship and conscience was enforced by the block and the faggot, by exile and by pains and penalties. Some 300 persons were executed for heresy in Queen Mary's reign, 178 in Queen Elizabeth's. King Charles I. might have saved his head if he had only consented to part with the bishops. King James II. was driven into exile in consequence of his declaration for liberty of conscience in the interests of Romanism and in support of his attack on the Protestant Church. In all history perhaps no more loathsome pages are to be found than those which describe the cruel religious persecutions and the squabbings and intrigues of the various religious parties concerned, between the reign of Henry VIII. and the Revolution. We may well imagine that the country was sick unto death of it all and was determined to put an end to it. This was effected after the Revolution through the Toleration and other Acts of Parliament.

~ It is now time, it appears, to change the venue and to endeavour to make some acquaintance with the philosophy of the subject, prevalent at that important era and also, so far as is needful, with the legislation by which the system of Toleration was projected and completed.

To begin with the former—Locke had made the subject of Toleration his own by writing in the year 1666, the "Essay concerning Toleration." This tract was superseded by his First Letter on Toleration, written in Latin in the spring of 1669. He was then living in exile in Holland, having been deprived of a studentship in Christ Church, in the University of Oxford, through the influence of the Court, because he was a man of high talent and because he had been the bosom friend of Lord Shaftesbury. There

are four letters of the philosopher on Toleration, but our attention will be confined to the first, as a suitable and sufficient introduction to the subject. The other letters, or at least two of them, are hard to understand without the correspondence, to which they are answers.

Here at this stage I am quite aware that I am attempting to deal with the most tedious and troublesome part of my task. The path to the objective threads a labyrinth of many mazes. To lighten the way for the kind readers, who are disposed to plod all the way along with me, I think I had better indicate in advance the stages arranged, so that they may be cheered by knowing where they are and what progress they are making. I propose to take the following matters in succession :—

1. Notes taken, *currente calamo*, of the philosophy of toleration.
2. Synopsis of contents of the so-called Toleration Act.
3. Inferences as to legitimate State action as regards religion for moral instruction.
4. The philosophy of neutrality.
5. Indian Government's practice of neutrality.
6. Toleration the only policy admissible under the Magna Charta, the Queen's Proclamation.
7. Proposed definition with recommendations.

Taking up the first letter on Toleration, I would observe that in the age of Locke it was by no means enough that any new project should be commended by a good conscience; conscience had hardly come by its own yet. What was much more essential was, that the novelty should be sanctioned by religion, that is by the Church and by texts from Scripture in its favour. It would be much easier to find a text, strongly denouncing neutrality (Revelation iii. 16, for instance), than to find anything in the least degree savouring of religious toleration. It is a new principle, applied to the Christian religion, a development in fact comparable with another achievement of a like nature, which I hope to indicate and illustrate in the next chapter. Any assistance from the Church was hopeless: leagued with the State, it had been the chief cause of the horrors and distresses of the preceding hundred and fifty years. How does Locke surmount this barrier to a start? By an effort of the imagination, he imagines the actual Church out of the way and replaced by the *true Church*, his own ideal in fact, the chief characteristic of which

he says is mutual toleration among Christians. Let a man be ever so proud of the powers and glories of the Church "yet if he be destitute of charity, meekness, and goodwill in general towards all mankind, even to those that are not Christians, he is certainly yet short of being a true Christian himself" (pp. 1 and 2, ed. 1812). Some far-fetched texts are then provided in the course of argument in favour of these fine sentiments. Having offered an explanation of this manœuvre required by the age, we need not wait to consider whether the texts furnish adequate support. Religious toleration may be regarded, as by general admission, one of the chiefest glories of the English race, one of the chiefest boons bestowed by it on the human race.

Further on (p. 9) the philosopher says: "I esteem it above all things necessary to distinguish exactly the business of civil government from that of religion, and to settle the just bounds that lie between the one and the other." It is the business of Government to procure, preserve and advance "civil interests which include life, liberty, health and indolency of body (comfort); and the possession of outward things such as money, lands, houses, furniture and the like" (p. 10). There is here, it may be observed, no mention of that control of spiritual affairs which, as has been shown, was exercised by all Governments throughout antiquity and down to 1689. It is admitted that the ruler may make use of arguments to draw the erring into the way of truth, but it is said, this is common to him with other men. . . . "He may certainly do, what becomes any good man to do" (p. 11). This we see is the limit of the State's interference with religion. According to the philosopher a new epoch in history has been reached by mankind; civil Governments must in future confine themselves to the care of the things of this world (p. 13)

Now about "the world to come," to use the phraseology of the letter. A Church, we are told, is a "voluntary society of men, joining themselves together of their own accord in order to the public worshipping of God, in such manner as they judge acceptable to him and effectual to the salvation of their souls" (p. 13). As the joining the church is absolutely free and spontaneous, "it necessarily follows that the right of making its laws can belong to none but the society itself, or at least, which is the same thing, to those whom the society by common consent has authorised thereunto."

Such being the character of a Church, it is obvious that the duty of toleration would not prevent the excommunication of any member who obstinately disregarded the rules of the society. Nor would it be consistent with it that any person should be prejudiced in worldly affairs because he belonged to another Church or religion. "No violence or injury is to be offered him, whether he be Christian or pagan. Nay, we must not content ourselves with the narrow measures of bare justice: charity, bounty and liberality must be added to it" (p. 17). We ought to be saying things of the like sort, if we were discussing Indian castes.

So far as toleration is concerned it ought to make no difference to which Church or religion the ruler belongs. "For the Civil Government can give no new right to the Church nor the Church to the Civil Government. . . . Churches have neither any jurisdiction in worldly matters, nor are fire and sword any proper instruments to convince men's minds of error and inform them of the truth" (p. 19).

Again "neither single persons, nor churches, nay, nor even commonwealths, have any just title to invade the civil rights and worldly goods of each other, upon pretence of religion" (p. 20). The Hindu therefore commits an offence against the system of toleration, when he attempts to induce his rulers to prevent his neighbours of other religions from slaughtering the cattle they possess, albeit his own religious feelings are deeply injured by such treatment of the divinities, which his religion compels him to hold in holy reverence. The rights of property must be maintained by all rulers worthy of the position.

The philosopher proceeds to deal in detail with the action of the magistrate in the various incidents which come before him. It is unnecessary to follow him over the field which has already been traversed in the company of those under his jurisdiction, but new ground is entered in the sphere of moral conduct, of which no mention has hitherto been made. "A good life," it is said, "in which consists not the least part of religion and true piety concerns also the civil Government: and in it lies the safety both of men's souls and of the commonwealth. Moral actions belong therefore to the jurisdiction both of the outward and inward court, both of the civil and domestic governor; I mean both of the magistrate and conscience" (p. 41). It is admitted that there is great danger

of conflict between the order of the magistrate and the voice of conscience, but still it is maintained that due attention to the limits prescribed will remove all difficulty.

It is the business of each individual to use his best endeavours to secure his own everlasting welfare, things temporal being of little consequence in comparison. In discharge of this duty a man need not take it upon himself to use force or compulsion to his neighbour, who appears to be sacrificing his eternal interest by wrong courses, because the conduct of the latter infringes no right of the former. Nevertheless the former is not to be condemned if he charitably admonish the neighbour to mend his ways; this is indeed one of the first duties of right thinking men; the neighbour, however, is under no obligation to give heed to such admonitions: he is his own master. Men in this world must live by their own industry; nature does not yield her products spontaneously. Some men are so depraved that they will not scruple to plunder the fruits of other men's industry. The remedy for this is the formation of societies, who devolve the charge of general protection against evil-doers on magistrates. Their business is restricted "to promoting the temporal good and outward prosperity of the society" (p. 43). Every member of society should be guided by his conscience in securing his own salvation "Obedience is due in the first place to God and afterwards to the laws" (p. 43).

Should the two authorities on occasion conflict, what then? This, it is asserted, with faithful administration will seldom occur, but, if it do, the individual must submit to undergo wrongful punishment in consequence of any matter within the magistrate's jurisdiction. Not so, if the magistrate act outside his authority, if he seek to institute, for instance, a new religion, if he prescribe strange ceremonies, if he pass unjust laws, to transfer property from one citizen to another for no good reason.

If the magistrate be determined to pursue the career just indicated, if he believe it for the public good, what resource is there for the individual? The philosopher thinks that in that case God alone can judge. He hints that there will probably be resistance, that the magistrate being the stronger will probably have the best of it, but he avers that, as philosopher, he is not disposing of a question of might but of right.

Some special cases are next considered. Opinions contrary to

human society and the moral rules it is necessary to maintain, cannot, it is said, be tolerated by the magistrate. A Church has no right to be tolerated, which requires all its members to place themselves at the disposal of a foreign prince. Roman Catholics are meant to be indicated. "Lastly those are not at all to be tolerated who deny the being of God" (pp 46, 47) on whom promises, covenants, and oaths can have no hold. Papists and disbelievers in the Holy Trinity were kept subject to disabilities by the Toleration Act, as we shall see. These reservations may be regarded as the unavoidable consequences of the troubles and distresses of a bygone age. They are the beam in the eye of the great humane philosopher, which had an equally firm place in that of the Government of the Revolution. It was accordingly maintained as law by that Government. It was finally wiped out by the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, to complete the system of toleration. We have reached the first stage of our tedious journey.

2. Synopsis of the contents of the Toleration Act.

I am hopeful that the foregoing notes may be sufficient to introduce readers to the ideal of the toleration system, towards the attainment of which the Act was the first step taken. At first glance it has the aspect of a stupendous conundrum, quite beyond the possibility of solution by ordinary human intelligence. Macaulay devotes five closely printed pages of his history (Chap. XI., ed. 1864) to describe and comment on it. "Of all the Acts that have ever been passed by Parliament," he tells us, "the Toleration Act is perhaps that which most strikingly illustrates the peculiar vices and the peculiar excellencies of English legislation." To a jurist he says, "that Act would seem to be a mere chaos of absurdities and contradictions." His discussion of it, enforcing these views, is very interesting and supplies much needed assistance towards its comprehension. My conception of it and of the development of the system, however, I found, were immensely improved by repeated perusals of this stiff piece of legal lore. I have been enabled thereby to present the following brief synopsis of the contents of the Act. It seems indispensable, however uninviting, if we are to be sufficiently grounded on this important subject.

The title is, "An Act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the penalties of certain laws." The word "toleration" nowhere appears in the

text and the short title "Toleration Act" is rather a misnomer. The declared object of its enactment was "to unite their Majesties' Protestant subjects in interest and affection." This was attempted to be effected by modifying the Government control of religion in favour of certain classes, just to the minimum extent necessary to satisfy those classes. In short the control was to be continued to the maximum extent, consistent with conciliating them.

The Act extends to sixteen clauses. The first covers eight inches by six inches of closely printed letterpress, and there is no full point until the close. It recites the Ecclesiastical legislation, by which the control of religion was exercised both as regards Protestants and Papists, and it lays down that, with the exception of two Statutes of the reign of Charles II., it shall not affect persons dissenting from the Church of England, who take certain oaths and sign a certain declaration before Justices of the Peace. They will also be exempted from the effects of previous convictions under these Statutes, still outstanding. And they will not be liable to any penalties under a certain Act, passed under Queen Elizabeth, nor under an Act of King Charles II. concerning Conventicles. The third Clause of the Act closes with the words: "Nor shall any of the said persons (dissenters from the Church of England) be prosecuted in any Ecclesiastical Court for, or by reason of, their Non-Conformity to the Church of England." This is the only shred of the Toleration Act which at the present day remains unrepealed and in force.

If these persons met for worship, it must be in buildings duly licensed by the Bishop of the Diocese or other authority, and with unbarred doors. They would not be exempted from payment of tithes or Church dues in consequence. If any one were elected to the office of Chief Constable or other Parochial functionary, he might perform the office by deputy. They might choose to register their oaths and declaration of their own accord. If they did not, and went to any "Meeting for exercise of Religion," they might be called on by any Justice of the Peace to make good the omission, and, on their failure to do so, be committed to be dealt with by the Court of Quarter Sessions. This Court might require them to furnish certain certificates of their belonging to some dissenting community, and, while this was being arranged, take security to the amount of £50, and in default commit them to prison. So much for the general mass of Protestant Dissenters.

Special provision was made for Quakers, who were guided by the precept, "Swear not at all." They might make two declarations, one of fidelity and one of adherence to the Christian faith, in order to obtain exemption.

Preachers and teachers for dissenting congregations were required, besides taking the oaths and making the declaration, to declare their approbation of 35 of the 39 Articles of Religion, and also of a portion of one other Article and to register the same in a Court of Quarter Sessions.

Anabaptist preachers and teachers were exempt from approving of one additional article concerning the baptism of infants. All these preachers and teachers were exempted from service on jury and from holding certain parochial offices.

Anglicans who were on the side of the Revolution Government, and did not require to be conciliated, had no concession made them. They might be required to pay a fine of twelve pence for every absence from religious service, hereafter as heretofore, unless they attended service at some Conventicle, when they would be liable to be dealt with on dissenting lines.

Papists and persons who denied the Holy Trinity, that is Deists and Atheists, were specially declared not to be affected by the Act by clause 14, introduced apparently to cancel the effect of clause one in favour of these persons. That is to say an exemption was first provided for these classes, but it was carefully withdrawn before the end of the Act was reached ! It will be remembered that Locke in the First Letter dealt in the same harsh way with these people. Papists were under disability and outside the body politic until the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 was passed in their favour. This completed the English system of religious toleration ; all the Ecclesiastical legislation referred to in the first clause of the Act together with nearly the whole of this Act having been repealed either by the Emancipation Act or by previous Statutes, which we need not consider.

The Toleration Act, it will be observed, contains no provision, with regard to the State providing religious or moral instruction, or forbidding any interference of this nature. The obvious reason for this was that any requirements of this character devolved on the Established Church and the Non-Conformist Churches. Locke, it will be remembered, just approached the verge of the subject of

religious and moral teaching, when he contended that the State might give good advice to its subjects, just as a good citizen might. The State could go no further, because religion was outside its sphere. Moral actions, on the other hand, were within its jurisdiction. He does not, however, go on to prescribe what the State may or may not do in regard to teaching morality. There was very good reason why he should abstain. It was outside the subject of his letter, which dealt only with religion. Moral and religious instruction had always been the business of the Church; it would doubtless also be the business of the Churches which he desired to tolerate. Education of any sort was in his time a private matter, except so far as the Church was concerned. It was not until the year 1832, as we have seen, that the State made any contribution to public education.

We find two references in the Act to the holding of certain offices by Dissenters. It had better be explained that under the prior *régime* in accordance with the Test Act it was only members of the Church of England who could hold any office, civil or military. A proposal to repeal the Test Act proved fruitless.

The policy of the Government in regard to the Toleration Act is explained by a Bill for Comprehension (*i.e.* within the Church) which was before Parliament at the same time. Its object was to induce the great majority of the Dissenters to return to the fold of the Church. If the Bill had passed, all the Dissenters, save a small remnant, would have been included in the Church and so the old control would have been in effect preserved. There was great controversy over the Comprehension Bill and it failed to pass, while the Toleration Act was passed without a division in either House. The effect of the Act was to establish Dissent and Non-Conformist Churches alongside the State Church. The latter was disestablished in Ireland in 1871, and its disestablishment in Wales is now in progress.

We may, I think, now congratulate ourselves not only in having disposed of the great conundrum but in having learned all that we require to know about the completion of the system of toleration in England, to which in my humble opinion the very highest importance is to be attached, not only in England, but also in all the countries ruled by Governments under British auspices. We may well regard it as a decree of Destiny, affecting human history, the

Protestant religion in particular and in a less degree perhaps many other religions, which has been painfully traced line by line with blood and tears, during a period of nearly three centuries; it is quite on a level with the Reformation or with our Constitutional History, by which England has been schoolmistress to all the world; it is the heritage and birthright of all Britons and of all citizens of the Indian Empire.¹ The last named have only been defrauded of it, so far as the evidence available shows, by a piece of ill luck in a period of war and calamity like the present, which led the merchant princes of Leadenhall Street to export by their Calcutta mail a noxious speciosity, before the toleration system was absolutely complete. This let the Indian Government into a rut, in which it has been content to move along for more than a century. A small tincture of philosophy would have enabled it to detect the worthless character of the article aforesaid. "Speciosities are specious. Ah me!" said Carlyle. Of all countries in the world India with all her religions was the one that stood most in need, for sound government, of the application of the system of toleration, and by a wonderful arrangement, one might almost venture to say, of Providence, England her guide and protectress was the only one capable of supplying the boon needed, to enable all men of whatever creed, or cult, or colour to make their free choice according to conscience, and having done so, to live together in love and amity with mutual respect under a benevolent government.

3. Legitimate State action with religion for moral instruction.

With the foregoing sketch before us setting forth the relations between the State and religion at various eras, while not forgetting

¹ All this notwithstanding, there is only too good reason for suspecting that this transcendent political principle has all but faded from the memory of those whose duty it is to bear it in mind and to enforce it. I am constrained to this admission by perusal of the very interesting speech of the Secretary of State for War on the 20th August, 1916, at Kimmel Park Military Camp. We learn from it that at the War Office an undenominational committee has been appointed to advise the Secretary of State and the War Council as to making religious arrangements to meet the exigencies of the national army, composed as it is of citizens of all faiths, all sects, all creeds. It is recognised that every variety of these should have fair play and just treatment. What other conclusion could be arrived at? It is a matter for surprise that a Minister of the Crown should have thought it necessary to fortify himself on a fundamental principle of British polity, settled for ever centuries back, by consulting the leaders of all the religious faiths of the country. He was glad to find that all were alike anxious that every variety of religious belief should receive all due consideration at his hands. We may assume that the speech was appropriate and called for by the occasion, but, if this be so, it must surely be regarded as a very significant political curiosity.

the calamitous history of England between the Reformation and the Revolution and especially the many distressing persecutions for religion during that time, it should be no matter for surprise that a Government under British auspices, in a country like India with many religions, should seek, as far as possible, to limit its responsibilities in respect of religion.

I have not been able to discover that any legal limitation has been imposed on the Indian Government by the various Acts of Parliament, by which it has been constituted. The Indian Council Act of 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67), by clauses 19 and 43, prescribes certain procedure for legislating with regard to religion, religious rights and usages. The Indian Government Act of 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106), by clause 87, lays down that religion shall be no bar to employment in the case of natives, and, by clause 92, that the bishops of the Church of England shall be restricted in accordance with Her Majesty's Royal letters patent. The Government of India has, therefore, it may be said, complete liberty from a legislative standpoint to frame its own religious policy in accordance with the system of toleration. On the executive side it has been restricted by an ancient Despatch, noted in the Introduction, which I have not been able to find published anywhere, to a policy of complete neutrality in matters of religion, which is something very different.

I hope to demonstrate before closing this chapter, that there ought to be no delay whatever in removing this trammel, and in anticipation of succeeding in this, with the reader's kind permission, I would ask what is a proper policy for the Indian Government in regard to the teaching of religion in accordance with the system of toleration? India, be it observed, is a country with many religions and many sects, with no Church established by law or any other institutions, which can be depended on everywhere to teach the young either religion or morality. If we are to be guided by the philosopher, it is obvious that there is no room for any initiative on the part of the Government as to devising a new religion; natural religion, for instance. The Commission of 1882 propounded a notion in direct opposition to all the philosophy of toleration, which has received from Government the scant attention it deserved. As little is there any room for imposing a religion already practised by one community on any other. According to Locke, as we saw,

each community, being a voluntary society, must be left free to formulate the rules and doctrines by which it will be guided. Is there any objection then to Government enabling or assisting any community to teach religion to its youthful members? It would be a very improper thing for the Government to select any community or communities to bestow on them this special mark of favour, but if it chose to treat all communities alike, one ground of objection would be removed. This was the notion submitted to the Commission by the gallant witnesses from the Panjab, when they ventured to beard it and to tell it that their State education (of 1854) was exerting a very demoralising influence on the after-lives of the students; that it was actually encouraging anti-religion in the most indirect manner. One thing, however, has been settled by philosophy and history and human experience, that in free and enlightened communities religion is properly outside the province of Government, and that its duties are sufficiently onerous without making any addition to them, which can be avoided. On the other hand, morality is within the Government sphere; it was a matter, according to the philosopher, to be adjusted between the Government and the individual, somehow. Has morality anything to do with religion? I hope to show in the next chapter that in certain stages of human progress religion absolutely controls and even includes morals according to the ideas generally prevalent; that in the most advanced stage yet reached it exercises a most potent influence on morals and on public welfare. I am sorry to be so soon again driven to borrowing the results promised in future pages, but it is difficult to avoid this in dealing with such a diversity of subjects and with so many elements mutually interacting on each other. Well, if such notions as to the effect of religion on morality be well founded, then the case as to religious instruction and the Government's concern with it is altogether altered. A claim has been established for Government's interesting itself in religious instruction to such an extent at least, as may be necessary for providing the rising generation of pupils and students with a fair moral outfit for the journey of life. The interest is a limited one. It does not extend to any participation in profound or original religious thought or in high or obscure philosophy claiming kindred with religion in any community. The respect and goodwill of each religious community would be sedulously cultivated; its leading

and its most intelligent members would be requested to collect and formulate the best moral and religious notions actually current in the form of precepts in the community from time to time. The Government or other authority in dealing with the leaders would not arrogate to themselves any right to form an opinion as to the value or truth of any of the religious matter, included in the collection, and they would carefully avoid any discussion or anything in the nature of controversy regarding it. They would approve or disapprove of it, sans phrase. It might be different with the moral part, as that is within their jurisdiction according to the words of the philosopher. The aim would be to impress the contents of the syllabus as effectually as possible on the schoolgoing and college members of each community by themselves in their early years, so that they might grow up to be worthy citizens and not become anarchists and political conspirators. "Such a mighty power is habit in (young and) tender subjects."

4. Neutrality.

The conclusion just arrived at constitutes a certain inroad perhaps on the Government policy with regard to religion, so far as education is concerned. "The Government," we are told, is "bound to maintain a position of complete neutrality in matters of religion." On this subject we are left very much in the dark. We are not told whence comes the bond that binds the Government, whether it is anything more than its own free choice in accordance with its own view of what is expedient. Some light on this subject would be an inestimable boon. Besides this obscurity the meaning and effect of this complete neutrality has nowhere, so far as appears, been sufficiently explained and illustrated. Treatises have been devoted to the discussion of such an alternative policy as mutual religious toleration, and they are of great practical value, so far as they go. Similar exposition in regard to a policy of neutrality is a still greater desideratum; the word is a simple negative and it is very difficult to conceive with any certainty what courses of action are supposed to be banned by it. We have no authoritative information as to the motive and object of the policy; we are left to form the best conjectures we can. This is unfortunate. I have just attempted to set forth what assistance is required for imparting moral instruction—a matter in which Government is deeply interested. Owing to the prevailing obscurity it is impossible to decide whether

this would or would not be an infringement of the policy of neutrality as Government understands it. I have a strong suspicion that the suggested operations would be disallowed out of hand, because they could not be explained without introducing the word "religion," which is practically tabooed in all dealings with Government. My humble and respectful contention is that neutrality in religion is an enigma, to which no certain value can be attached. In diplomacy it is subject to various qualifications. It may be strict, absolute, or it may be benevolent, while there are endless degrees of benevolence. To the writer, on the other hand, a benevolent neutrality appears to be a clear contradiction in terms, the union of something positive with a thing which is wholly negative. The mere possibility of such doubts concerning a policy of the first importance is sufficient for condemning the terms chosen and for substituting something intelligible to everybody. An enigmatic definition is liable to confuse and lead astray the Government and its officials; it is still more likely to bamboozle its subjects and to cause them to imagine that they have been deceived and betrayed by double dealing. To show what doubts are involved in the use of the word neutrality even in its ordinary diplomatic sense and quite apart from religion, I give in a note ¹ underneath two quotations from a recent French work by M. Alfred Loisy, a distinguished Frenchman of letters, which I find in the *Spectator* of March 18th, 1916. The

¹ *Spectator*, 18th March, 1916, page 386

But this leads to something much more important than satire, and more worthy of M. Loisy's great powers

(1) "Most Holy Father, with all due respect to your infallibility, you are in error about your phrase. Do not say you are impartial or you will be compelled to formulate a judgment and even to declare yourself against the cause of injustice; but say frankly that you are neutral, because that is the naked and shameless truth."

The passage in which M. Loisy draws the distinction between impartiality and neutrality is in our judgment the best thing in his pamphlet, and we feel sure it will commend itself to the people of the United States:—

(2) "By impartiality is understood that perfect justice which ought to be followed in the treatment of persons and the estimate of things. Neutrality has nothing moral in it, has no common link with justice: it implies a wholly passive attitude with regard to other people's quarrels, considering neither the facts nor the reasons which may influence the opposing parties. Impartiality is a duty and a virtue: neutrality is only a part of common prudence, one might even say of policy. Thus impartiality and neutrality are quite different things: in fact they are incompatible with one another in the sphere of morals; for no one has any right to be neutral in moral questions. And whoever pretends to be neutral in matters where justice is concerned, fails to be impartial. As a matter of fact, whoever in such a matter claims to be indifferent is in reality siding with him who is in the wrong and against him who is right."

Spectator critic says they are the best thing in the book, which appears to be one criticising the attitudes and behaviour of the belligerents and neutrals affected by the present war. My only object in making the quotation is to show that the word neutrality is a very difficult one to handle and requires high critical power for the business; that it may be good enough for diplomatists and experts, but that something plainer and less uncertain is desirable for the work of internal administration. I have already shown that an illustrious statesman, of unlimited literary capacity, who was perhaps the first to use the instrument, I venture to find fault with, in the cause of education, made the most serious mistakes in the operation. Neutrality, I would submit, may be consistent with feelings of aloofness, indifference and even of bitter contempt as in the case of Macaulay. If the subject, *à propos* of which the attitude of neutrality is supposed to be assumed, were any other than religions, than in fact all the religions of the King-Emperor's subjects, the matter might perhaps be allowed to pass without remark, but under the circumstances the Government seems to be voluntarily, but quite unconsciously of course, assuming in presence of the highest sanctities of mankind a position which cannot be otherwise regarded than unworthy of approval or acceptance by any who are capable of appreciating it. What an *ignis fatuus*, what a will-o'-the-wisp guidance to supply to officials in dealing with Indians concerning their religions, their most treasured possessions? In consequence, I believe very many Indians and some of my acquaintance, regard their own culture in the spiritual sphere immensely superior to that of the Government. The Government is thus by its avowed policy, I maintain, handicapping itself quite gratuitously without any object to be gained, save steady adherence to an ancient formula, plausible I admit, and apparently simple, but really enigmatic and possessing a compass of evil effect immensely wider than the object aimed at, viz. the expression of a resolve to abstain from all acts injurious to Indian religions. It amounts to a selection of a special section of the field of toleration with a renunciation of the remainder, sufficiently ample to utterly destroy the proffered boon.

5. Indian Government practice of religious neutrality.

Moreover let us inquire how does the avowed policy square with the record of the Indian Government? Can it be denied that the history of the Higher Education displays a continuous violation of

it for generations by the introduction of exotic sciences and literature without the adoption of any precaution, worthy of consideration, in spite of the most serious warnings? The subject of religious neutrality was discussed from an objective standpoint by Mr. Howell in 1868¹ (pp. 34, 35), with great restraint although he evidently entertained the most serious misgivings. He was an official without, so far as appears, any *parti pris*. He gives expression to a conviction that the higher instruction does necessarily destroy religious belief, whereas the instruction in primary schools is less serious. The Commission of 1882 failed for reasons already explained to give any verdict on these moot points. If it had, from all that appears, there must have been a very damaging exposure. If any further proof were required, it is supplied by the existence of the anarchists and by the State trials.

An important case in point is the passing of Regulation XVII. of 1829, for the abolition of Sati or the practice of burning or burying alive Hindu widows, as a religious duty. The preamble is of unusual length and sets forth at length the reasons for legislating in a matter concerning religion. It is there alleged that the practice is nowhere enjoined by the religion of the Hindus, as a religious duty; that in passing the law there is no intention to "depart from one of the first and most important principles of the system of British Government in India, that all classes of the people be secure in the observances of their religious usages, so long as that system can be adhered to without violation of the paramount dictates of justice and humanity." I gather from this pronouncement, that there are certain limits to the forbearance of the Government, as regards interference with acts, alleged to be of a religious character, although a position of *complete* neutrality is alleged in the Resolution quoted in the Introduction. It is quite right that it should be so, as India is a "nurse of religions" and there is no telling what astounding novelties may at any time be presented, and their toleration demanded on the plea of religion.

The Government action in abolishing Sati has been universally approved of. There has been no demur on the part of the Hindus, although the notion has not yet, after nearly a century, been altogether eradicated from Hindu mentality, and cases every now and

¹ See Appendix I.

again occur. One was reported from the district of Alipur in January, 1915.

An institution of a similar but much less serious character is the Hook-swinging Festival in honour of the goddess Kali. It used to be celebrated at Kalighat, the village from which Calcutta derives its name. Devotees, vowed to self-torture, submitted to be swung in the air, supported only by hooks, suspended from high poles, passed under the muscles over the blade bones. The writer witnessed the spectacle in 1864, but it is now prohibited in British territory ("Encyclop. Brit.," ed. xi.), owing to the British Government's interference with a religious rite, merely because it was barbarous and indecent. The interference was right and proper of course, but it was an infringement of the avowed policy.

The legislation, with regard to administering oaths and solemn affirmations to witnesses in Court, from Act V. of 1840 to Act X. of 1873, involves an interference with religion by the State of continual and everyday occurrence. A witness must bring his religion to court with him when he is summoned to give evidence, or declare that he has none. After the witness has been asked by the court usher whether he is a Hindu or a Muslim the usher repeats a form of words *with a reference to the Supreme Being as present and looking on*, the word Parameshur being used to indicate the Supreme Being in the case of the Hindu and Khuda for the Muslim. If the witness say he is neither Hindu nor Muslim and he knows nothing of such a Being, he will be required to repeat the form with the reference omitted. The procedure seems to involve a State interference with religion, of which, however, no one has any right to complain.

Lastly, to crown all, we have in the past September the surprising intelligence that the Government of India has given a yearly recurring grant of a lakh of rupees to the Hindu University of Benares. I am not questioning the wisdom of this bounty, but I admit being completely baffled to understand how it can be reconciled with a policy of "complete neutrality in matters of religion," which, in Macaulay's words, "ought to be sacredly preserved." Has or has not, I must now ask, the Government already determined to abandon the policy I have ventured to impugn? If so, what is its new policy?

I have glanced through a Collection of Despatches from the Home Government to the Indian Government, No. LXXVI., Calcutta,

1870, in which about a dozen times the policy of religious neutrality is appealed to. The conclusion grows on me at least, that when it is seen that something must be done, it is resolved to do it whatever happens to the policy, as illustrated by the foregoing cases. The avowed policy of neutrality is then lost sight of, and is never alluded to. The appeal is then to the claims of justice, decency, humanity, rights of property and so forth. If, however, on the other hand, a difficult and doubtful business has to be tackled, the adjustment of which may affect religion, the official mind becomes nervous and troubled, the specious plea of neutrality is produced, *non possumus* is pronounced, the advocates of any change are sent away empty. In the course of events, however, a crisis will occur which has to be faced, which, come what may, has to be disposed of. The result is very interesting.

6 Toleration the only admissible policy under the Queen's Proclamation.

Such a case occurred in 1858 when Her Majesty, for divers weighty reasons, duly advised by Parliament, resolved to take on herself the direct government of the Indian territories. A suitable proclamation had to be framed with all care and forethought. India is a country of many religions, and the sketching of a proper policy in respect of them was inevitable. The task was accomplished with complete success. Perhaps no proclamation that was ever issued gave greater satisfaction to a greater number of human beings. Such a result is enough to stamp it as a model for any important feature of the contents without any critical examination. Religion - was perhaps the most weighty matter dealt with.

Having regard to the history of Indian administration both before then and since, one would reasonably expect that the policy of neutrality would form the main pronouncement in regard to religion, if it have any value whatsoever. Let me for the sake of ready reference and proof set out in full the two clauses of the Proclamation bearing on religion as follows :—

“ Eighth clause. Firmly relying Ourselves on the truth of Christianity and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of Religion, we disclaim alike the Right and the Desire to impose Our Convictions on any of Our subjects. We declare it to be Our Royal Will and Pleasure, that none be in any wise favoured, none molested or disquieted by reason of their Religious Faith or Observances but

all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the Law : and We do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under Us, that they abstain from all interference with the Religious Belief or Worship of any of Our Subjects on pain of Our highest Displeasure.

“(Ninth Clause) : And it is Our Will that so far as may be Our Subjects of whatever race or creed be freely and impartially admitted to offices in Our Service, the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability and integrity to discharge.”

I submit that I am right in asserting that in these clauses the formula neutrality has been dropped, as usual, when any serious business had to be done. It is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Neutrality is all negation. The negative matter in the proclamation is abundantly qualified by elements of a positive nature, appealing to the most powerful feelings of humanity. Consummate art is displayed in suggesting and implying an immense deal more than meets the eye at first glance. The subject is introduced by a brief tale, a tale known to be true, concerning the life experience of a most exalted personage, Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria. In the East it is a favourite method to impress an important truth by making it the moral of a story, perhaps generally invented for the purpose. It is taken for granted that Her Majesty's subjects-to-be have religions and religious experiences like Her Majesty, treasures on which they are left to put any value they please in response to Her affirmations of the same character. Her Majesty's sympathy and regard for these treasures of theirs are conveyed by means of the most generous promises of comfort and protection of their welfare both spiritual and temporal, set forth in the most weighty and impressive terms. A more direct mode of expression of Her Majesty's sentiments in regard to the various religions was not only liable to miscarry for those addressed, but also to give umbrage to other subjects of Her Majesty, the subject being of such a delicate nature. It seems impossible to imagine what literary talent would have sufficed to produce a proclamation so admirable, hailed with acclamation alike by British and Indian subjects, if the author had been restricted to a policy of “complete neutrality.” The document is inspired by the philosophy of mutual religious toleration, which is quite incompatible with complete neutrality in matters of religion. How

would such neutrality have been in accord with the Queen's own ancient title of "Defender of the Faith," at the head of the Proclamation? Would the Queen's subjects of all races and all religions be heartily inspired to join in singing together with holy fervour the National Anthem, if they were given to understand that the Sovereign, the living head of their Government was to be neutral, aloof, indifferent as regards religion. The Queen Herself, it may be observed, was no mean authority as regards such proprieties and She had among her Ministers at the time the Lord Derby of that day and also Mr. Disraeli,¹ not only distinguished Statesmen but also men of letters, who were not likely to tolerate any unseemly bonds on such an important occasion.

The conclusion appears inevitable that the formula religious neutrality is not only defective but harmful and dangerous, and that it should long ago have been replaced by something more tolerable and useful.

7. Proposed definition.

The results of the foregoing discussion may thus be summarised.

1. The action of the Government of India in providing effective means of Moral Instruction has been brought to a standstill, because its policy in regard to religion is enigmatic and, as usually understood, does not allow it sufficient freedom, to enable it to adopt suitable methods for the purpose.

2. That the said policy, as usually understood, is utterly at variance with the action of Government in the Education Department since it was instituted and with other proceedings of Government on various important occasions.

3. That in humanity and generosity of spirit it is a striking contrast to the spirit and intention displayed in Queen Victoria's

¹ In the *Spectator* of May 13th, 1916, in a critique of the 4th volume of the "Life of Disraeli," I find the following relevant matter:—"The Mutiny followed the Crimean War, and in perceiving what justice and conciliation required in India, Disraeli was at his best. Something of the Oriental in his temperament gave him the necessary sympathy, and enough of Western training gave him the necessary corrective. It was a feat to forecast the memorable Proclamation of 1858—memorable for its combination—of candour and dignity—in which Queen Victoria expressed how the Crown instead of the Company would govern India, and how while she held fast to the Christian religion she would never force it upon unwilling subjects. The Proclamation was actually written by Derby, but Mr Buckle's description of Disraeli's attitude towards India indicates quite clearly the source of the ideas and the language." As the facts, now perhaps for the first time published, exactly correspond with my anticipations I leave the text, written some months ago, to stand and be corrected by this note.—A. H. B.

Proclamation of 1858, on assuming the Government of India, the promises of which ought to be fulfilled *optima fide*.

4. That it falls far short of the spirit of humanity, charity, and goodwill prescribed by the great expositor of the system of toleration, a glory and a heritage of the British race, that it does not enable Government to do justice to its real sentiments but tends in a measure to array public sentiment against it.

For all these reasons (and many might be added) a revision of the definition of policy without delay appears urgent. The writer ventures to submit that the following would fairly meet all the exigencies that have come to light in the course of the discussion, viz. :—

“The Government will regard all religions with impartial favour and respect; it will repress all acts which violate law, humanity, justice or decency, and all infringements of the rights of property, notwithstanding any plea of justification on religious grounds,” or, to put it briefly, “Impartial favour for all religions with maintenance of the Law.”

It may be observed that the proposed definition is only an application to members of all religions of what is required by Locke at the beginning of the First Letter of every Christian who claims to be in favour of toleration. “If,” says the philosopher, “he be destitute of charity, meekness, and goodwill in general towards all mankind, even to those that are not Christians, he is certainly yet short of being a true Christian himself.”

Let us suppose that the kindly action suggested were taken by the Government, it should evoke a corresponding response from all its subjects of whatever religion; they would be constrained to follow a kindly lead steadily maintained; they would respect and bear each other goodwill, because their Government will show them all equal favour and respect. So much for the first subclause of the definition. The second amounts only to this, that religious pleas will not prevent the law taking its course; religion should properly secure the fulfilment of the law, never in any case its abolition.

It is maintained that some such change of policy is a condition precedent to any sound system of moral instruction. Further, that the definition is only a wise and just tribute to the elemental sanctities of the extensive regions of the Indian Empire and of the

immense populations, in the bulk sincerely loyal to the Indian Government; that it can be graciously accorded without any risk whatever; that it will at the same time provide for the honour and security of the Government and contribute to the well-being and the spiritual comfort of its subjects.

It may take considerable time to work out any practical scheme of ethical instruction; that to be proposed may be reasonable or futile, on the whole sound or in need of great improvement. If the argument in favour of the condition precedent meet with approval, the principle should be adopted and put in execution without any delay, this part of the scheme being quite independent of that which remains to be explained.

We shall next proceed to discuss religion, morality, and their mutual relations.

CHAPTER V

*RELIGION AND MORALITY—THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS

RELIGION and Morality are the chief conductors of the drama of Humanity. They are at present, according to some philosophers, engaged in a long-drawn-out Act in the interesting operation of exchanging places. It may well appear presumptuous for a mere mortal to pretend in a few pages to explain their relations. The writer only hopes, with the aid of history, as with a carpenter's rule, to draw a few lines, the scope of which for the problem in hand it is essential to comprehend. To avoid misunderstanding it appears prudent, at the outset, to offer definitions suited to Indian conditions.

Religion, I may say, is a scheme for the conduct of life, based on a theory of the Universe, *or on reverence for a venerated sage*

The words in italics are added in order to include Buddhism, which does not propound any theory of the Universe in the ordinary sense of the words. With this explanation no objection to the definition is anticipated.

Morality, again, is a system of rules for the conduct of life, *adapted to a particular social and religious environment.*

It is expected that here the words italicised may prove a subject of contention, and it is proposed in the sequel to prove that they are suitable and indispensable.

If we cast our eyes round the planet and survey the principal nations and their religions, leaving out of account primitive and barbarous tribes, we shall be compelled to admit that the world is indebted for such morality as it possesses to the Founders of religions and their followers, and to such religions of Nature as the Hindu religion, which is not supposed to have been founded by any particular individual. Christians have their own moral system; so have Muhammadans; so have Hindus. Indeed they may have several or many systems owing to communities differing in religion

and in other features. None of these religious communities would think of changing their own moral system for any other, nor any part of it. The proposal, for instance, that Christians should drop the Sermon on the Mount and adopt a few Suras of the Kuran instead, would be simply offensive and ridiculous. "Why," I may be asked, "do you trifle by airing such absurd fancies?" I quite admit that the suggested interchanges of moral systems are absurd and impossible, but I contend in all seriousness, that they are only on a par with the recommendation of the Indian Commission of 1883, to attempt to prepare a moral text-book, based on the fundamental principles of natural religion, to be taught in all Government and all aided schools. The quoted paragraph of the Government Education Resolution of 1913 is not explicit, but it affords some ground for fearing a recurrence to the old idea of the text-book of 1883, and of providing moral instruction for general use, just like a text-book for any of the Sciences. The so-called Direct Moral Instruction method now in operation, ~~to~~ which attention has already been called, clearly clashes with the definition and the principle it is intended to assert.

The bond of a common religion constitutes a powerful influence to induce men to live in Communities, to associate with each other and to co-operate in promoting and defending their common interests. Morals takes its rise from social intercourse. That men may live together in amity and enjoy each other's society, they must conform their conduct to actions calculated to obtain the general approval. They must know what is expected of them by their fellows, and they must be animated by a desire not to fall short of the standard, which is called "good morals." Religion, operating through the imagination, has a very powerful influence over human feelings and emotions. Its power over its votaries is based on the conviction that their position and well-being in this state of existence and perhaps too in others, which according to the theory may follow it, depend on compliance with its dictates. Religion contains the chief living power and momentum which go to invigorate the moral feelings and to promote social well-being. We have fuller information of the religion of the Jews, of their progress and of their blacksliding, through the Old Testament than we have regarding any other ancient people. No one who studies that history, especially with the aid of such volumes elucidating it as those of

the late Robertson Smith, will doubt the immense power with which religion dominated not only the morals but also the whole economy of an ancient people.

It is accordingly established that in early history religion was the predominant element; the Religious Reformer not only propounded the religious doctrines, which he was able to induce his followers to accept, but he also provided the moral precepts by which their conduct in life was to be guided in order to secure their religious and moral well-being. It is proposed now to make a succinct survey of many centuries and, calling in the aid of distinguished philosophers, to determine whether, at the present stage of human progress, Religion or the Moral Faculty ought properly to be regarded as the paramount authority for the control of human conduct.

The fact that Aristotle is the Prince of philosophers, not even, in my humble opinion, "*Platone excepto*," as Cicero would have it, is a good reason why we should give him our first attention. There is another reason, to which I attach quite as much weight. I am under the impression that the Government of India would immediately attempt the teaching of morals in all its schools quite apart from religion, if it could only see how the task could be accomplished with any hope of success. Now, of all the books I know, the only one that might seem to afford some such hope is the *Nicomachæan Ethics* of the great philosopher. After more than two millennia it is still not out of date, but is even held in as high esteem as ever. Throughout the treatise very little is said about religion or the Gods; and that little could be eliminated without impairing its value as a work on morals. It may well be asked, therefore: "Seeing that such a splendid feat could be accomplished in the discussion of morals without religion, why should the Indian Government's supposed venture on identical lines fail?" I am not assuming that the Government has ever devoted a thought to Aristotle or has been in the least degree influenced by his work; I am merely taking the precaution of anticipating and dealing with an objection, which might occur to any one.

I would reply to the supposed query, that the preparation of a first-class moral treatise and the imparting of moral instruction to the children of the masses are tasks of the most diverse character, and that any comparison of the one with the other is utterly useless. The moral treatise is based on definitions and argument, and it will

be appreciated by advanced students and philosophers, a class insignificant in numbers; it will not have the smallest bearing on elementary moral training, which can only be secured by very different methods, to be explained hereafter. It was quite easy for the philosopher to conduct with distinction his discussion of morality up to a point, and not to prejudice it by stopping short without examining the relations between religion and morality. If he had proceeded, he must have encountered the Greek religious mythology, which I have taken pains to describe at some length in previous pages. The philosopher was well aware that any exposition of his own views with regard to God or the Gods would place his life in great danger. As it was, he had to go into exile to evade a frivolous charge.

It is interesting to observe how cautious he is on the two most important occasions of reference to the Gods. "Now to be sure," he says at Book I. Cap. VII., "if anything else is a gift of Gods to men, it is probable that Happiness is a gift of Theirs too," and again at Book X., Cap. VII., "Because if, as is thought, any care is bestowed on human things by the Gods, then it must be reasonable to think, that They take pleasure in what is best and most akin to Themselves." He takes refuge in each case, we observe, behind the shelter of a conjunction. It is submitted, no conclusion relevant to our inquiry can fairly be drawn from the fact that Aristotle practically ignores the subject of religion in the *Ethics*.

Aristotle's treatment of the domain of the Moral Faculty is exceedingly interesting, if somewhat puzzling. He has no word to indicate it in its entirety. The word used in the *Apocrypha*, in the New Testament, and in modern Greek, viz. *syneidesis*, does not occur in Classical Greek. The Faculty is regarded as a compound of elements, as in recent modern philosophy. Moral action is accomplished by the following mental functions, viz. Right Reason, Will, a State of Moral Discipline (*Hexis*), Moral Choice and Deliberation. None of these nor apparently all combined have personality attributed to them. A whole book is required to settle what Right Reason is, and a chapter or two are devoted to each of the other elements. The writer cannot give space for any adequate summary of the different accounts nor can he afford to trifle with the patience of the reader, while so occupied. The order of procedure between the different functions, their action and interaction are not explained.

A novice might fancy that, when any wish or desire is presented to the Will, the Disciplined State with its Moral propensity, solely due to habituation, suggests Deliberation to the Right Reason; decision follows on Deliberation. If there be doubt a prudent person may be consulted. It is understood that nothing is virtuous which is not commended by the community; also, that virtue is a mean, somewhere between two extremes, which may or may not find a word in the Greek vocabulary to represent them. The necessity for deliberation in every case of moral decision will appear strange to persons with some acquaintance with philosophers' accounts of the modern conscience; generally the decision is all but instantaneous. The whole tenor of the discussion is objective: all the standards appealed to are outside the individual; the whole man, the inner man is never once appealed to. It could not well be otherwise, seeing that no personality was anywhere constituted to which appeal was possible. One might hazard a conjecture that the Moral Faculty presented to Aristotle, in the age and in the community in which he was living, was perhaps correctly analysed by such a genius, but was of a somewhat inchoate rudimentary character, regarded as a guide for human conduct. An Athenian, labouring under a superabundant load of mythology and religion, both taken to be unquestionable realities, could not be expected to hold his own, when there was any question whether his duty should be determined by mythology and religion or by his conscience.

The works of Plato and Aristotle remained as splendid monuments of their genius, to charm philosophers and lovers of philosophy, but the impression of their moral systems never reached the mass of the people or perceptibly affected it. One reason why the Peripatetic philosophy remained in vogue for only a very short time was the loss of Greek freedom owing to the Macedonian Conquest. Ethical training was intended to make good citizens, to be an introduction to Constitutional Politics, and to the Service of the State. When there were no longer Free States, Ethics had little purpose to serve. There was, however, another potent reason for the fall of the Peripatetics in the fact that they took little or no account of religion. In this respect they were a striking contrast to the chief school of philosophy by which they were succeeded, that of the Stoics. The Stoic philosophy, it was said, might be regarded as a

religion. No advance in respect of the philosophy of the Moral Faculty can be attributed to them, but they were intensely interested in the regulation of human conduct. On this account and on account of their treatment of religion it is desirable that the Stoics should engage our attention for a space.

The Stoics may be regarded as harbingers of the appearance of the Moral Sense on the World's stage. They had a large share in preparing the Roman world for the recognition of Christianity at a later date by their practical restriction of the Pantheon to a single God of Nature, of a Pantheistic character. A noteworthy feature is the foreign extraction of the leaders; none belonged to Continental Greece. Their freedom as regards religion may thus perhaps be accounted for. Zeno the Founder came from Cyprus; his successor Cleanthes from the Troad; and Chrysippus, reputed the second Founder, from Cilicia. These men had little or no literary talent, and so all their works have been lost with the exception of Cleanthes' hymn to Zeus. In it Zeus is addressed as embodying all the power and all the wisdom of the Universe, as conducting all operations, whether on earth, in æther, or in the sea, in fact as an eternal Providence. All the Gods and creatures, all things in Heaven and on Earth are regarded as His inseparable manifestations. This was an immense contrast to the Peripatetic notion of the Gods, all absorbed in the contemplation of Their own perfections, too happy to be disturbed by any thought of human or other affairs. Everything was supposed to be built up and consist of a substance called *Pneuma*, or Spirit of various degrees of tension. Such a system, physical, philosophical, and moral in closest alliance with religion, exercised an immense influence on the leaders of the Roman World.

The end of human existence was virtuous conduct in accordance with nature under the guidance of reason. The system was subjective, not objective. All men were either wise, possessed of virtue, or foolish—mostly foolish. There was in aiming at virtue a dead-set against emotion, as the evil thing. This entanglement in opposition to an element of human nature involved a system of casuistry in the development of a scheme of duties.

The Romans had little talent for abstract speculation, but they were much attracted to a school, which made the practical life its chief concern. Statesmen, engaged in campaigns in the East, made friends of Stoic philosophers and brought them home with them in

RELIGION AND MORALITY—THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS 87

their trains. Their households and friends were thus instructed in the system, which became a State philosophy. It influenced Roman jurisprudence, the law of nature being discerned as almost identical with the *jus gentium*. The Stoics, while maintaining their own ideas of the Supreme Divinity, contrived to live on terms with the Roman national religion, which, of course, could not forgo the institutions of Divination and Augury. The earlier leaders were blameable for advocating excessive freedom in family and sexual relations, but this was corrected in the writings of the later Stoics. Suicide was always regarded as an available resource and was sometimes had recourse to for very trivial reasons. The Stoic philosophy produced many characters of high distinction, greatly admired by Christians. The names of Panætius, Posidonius, Seneca, Lucan, Musonius, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus may be mentioned.

Moral qualities have had their effect on human conduct throughout history and doubtless long before it began. We have now reached the signal step in the climax, when their representative, the moral sense, is duly recognised and brought on the religious stage in the Metropolis of the World under the warrant of a letter from the Chief of the Apostles. It is known there under the name of Conscience. According to the Christian records the Founder never once alluded to it. There is no reference to it in the Jewish Scriptures. Yet in public life in Rome, it had already had for centuries a "local habitation and a name." In the daily life of the people and in the Courts of Justice it was at work, and being constantly appealed to. It is had recourse to in each of the first three of Cicero's speeches against Catiline, and in the third several times. In the orator's speech, *Pro Roscio* (perhaps the first he delivered), in defence of a man falsely accused of parricide, a long spell (Cap. XXIV.) is devoted to describing the horrors, by which the perpetrator of such an incredible offence would be tormented by conscience. Without any quotations it will readily be believed that the orator did justice to such a theme. There was thus the strongest reason possible why the Christian *locus classicus* on the subject of conscience (Rom. ii 15) should have appeared in this powerful all-comprehensive homily addressed to the Roman Converts. There was no other city in the world, the dwellers in which could have thoroughly appreciated the proffered doctrine, except

perhaps Alexandria, the home of the Apocrypha writers in the century preceding our era, which had long been politically captured and permeated by Roman influence. Rome has earned immense credit for her jurisprudence and Codes of Law, but the world's debt to her as the nurse of Conscience, the regulator of human conduct, seems to have been overlooked.

One of the objects of the Epistle to the Romans appears to have been, to reconcile to each other the two sections of Roman Christians, the Jewish and the Gentile. This is attempted by putting the latter on a level with the former, on the ground that their following their conscience, which was a law of nature, written in their hearts, was equivalent to the Jewish obedience to the Jewish law. We do not get very much further enlightenment, as regards the moral faculty, from examining the other passages, some thirty in number, where the word "syneidesis" occurs in the New Testament. The Apostolic writers appear to have accorded this element of human nature an authority equal to the gospel they were preaching. The seizing it and building on it seem to amount to a distinct development of the Christian Religion, as originally promulgated by the Founder (Fairbairn's "Christ in Modern Theology," pp. 25, 26). Thus also there was provided a very important step in advance for philosophy, unless my attempt in a former page to correctly appreciate Aristotle's views on the moral elements of the mind be wide of the mark.

Indian readers cannot be expected to be acquainted or agree with Christian teaching regarding the Holy Spirit. They may be curious to learn, how in the ordinary course of affairs St. Paul could have come by his views about conscience, seeing that he wrote the Epistle from Corinth two years before he visited Rome. His ideas display not only a knowledge of the mental phenomena but also of their robust existence in a Gentile Community, which, it appears, could only be the Roman. All his information could not, therefore, be ascribed to pure genius. He may, I should say, have had his attention drawn to the subject by passages in the Apocrypha, where the word occurs. Dean Alford tells us the Apostle was acquainted with Latin, but does not offer any authority for his statement. A knowledge of Latin would completely explain the matter, because a very limited acquaintance with that literature would enable him to understand the whole case. He was a man of invincible energy and was unlikely to forgo any advantage within

easy reach. It is proved he had some knowledge of Greek literature, and in such a case he was not likely to be content with a *little learning*. His weighty address to the Athenians about "The Unknown God" was a feat of consummate dexterity. He had an apt quotation from the poet Aratus, a Cilician like himself, but he showed he knew Greek Mythology and Greek weakness by cajoling them in respect of the Divine ancestry, to which they all laid claim. On another occasion he quoted from the comic poet Menander about "evil communications" (1 Cor. xv. 33). He set a high value on his Roman citizenship, he had an intense reverence for the Empire of Rome, as a Heaven-established power, as appears from Romans XIII, he had many opportunities of intercourse with Romans in his native Tarsus and on his travels; a man of his disposition was thus quite likely to acquire the information in question. His great merit in connection with the matter is his recognition of its importance. Cicero constantly handled the subject in everyday life, and so it was too familiar owing to use and wont, to be worth making the subject of one of his philosophical discussions. All philosophers were equally blind down to modern times.

The advancement of the Romans in the effective development of morality in comparison with the Greeks may be traced to a difference in the religious spirit, to an indifference to ideal elements, to a practical and utilitarian tendency (Mommsen, I 214). Their Chief Priests (Pontifices) were their bridge-builders and drew up their Calendar; they alone were competent to advise about legal principles and procedure. "At the very core of the Latin Religion," says Mommsen (I. 221), "there lay that profound moral impulse, which leads men to bring earthly guilt and earthly punishments into relation with the world of the Gods, and to view the former as a crime against the Gods and the latter as its expiation." This is one proof more of the indissoluble intimacy of the relation of morals to religion; the latter is, it is contended, the life and breath of the former.

Looking at the whole case, as far as we have gone, it does not appear a rash conclusion to draw, that if the Indian Government be, as it is, debarred from imparting religious instruction in its schools, it is equally debarred from attempting to impart moral instruction. If the latter operation be a State necessity, it follows that the task must be accomplished through independent agencies.

There remains for disposal the question, whether at the present day morality or religion is to be regarded as the predominant power. Doubtless from the nature of the case according to the historical development, as a matter of fact down to the passing of the Toleration Act, religion dominated. One object of that Act was to relieve the general public of all pains and penalties due to that domination. Hobbes, the last of the ancient philosophers and the first of the modern, based his conclusions in the "Leviathan" (published in 1651) on Reason and Scripture. This was, we may say, in accord with what has been noted in regard to the Apostolic writings. The same example has been followed by many philosophers after the passing of the Act, so that their writings afford no opportunity of testing the question, which of the two elements in the combined foundation is to be regarded as the more important. This applies to Samuel Clarke, to the Scotch philosophers Reid and Stewart, and also to Kant. A new note is first sounded by Bishop Butler, who propounds the query: "Which of two commands, a moral and a religious, should be obeyed?" and decides in favour of the former, on the ground that the "moral law is written upon hearts; interwoven into our very nature" ("Analogy," p. 159; 1736). As time has progressed, as Non-Conformity has gathered strength, as the Press has secured increasing influence, religion has waned and failed to maintain the position once occupied. If there be a Moral Faculty, which guides our conduct, logically the supremacy lies with it. The view now generally prevailing is that it is a compound faculty, which takes account of religious notions, emotions, passions, feelings, sensibilities, etc., and comes to a decision, which is the verdict of the whole man. There may be difficulties in special cases and there is no absolute guarantee, that with the use of all sincerity in every case the decision will be right. This account may be regarded as roughly representing the opinions of such recent philosophers as Bain, Leslie Stephen, Martineau, Green, and Spencer (Data of Ethics, Chap. VII), who doubtless differ in many details. Those interested in a philosophical subject of some difficulty may consult their works. We may accordingly regard Morality as now occupying the paramount position, which properly belongs to it.

According to the conclusion just arrived at, in cases in which interference in religious matters was indispensable the Government would be qualified and entitled to interfere, as it did in the case of

Sati, and to enforce a righteous decision. Under the method I am to suggest, it will not be the business of Government or other authority to formulate any scheme for Moral Instruction, but only to accept or reject, as they may deem fit, such schemes submitted to them by other independent authorities. The principle announced would qualify them, from a philosophical standpoint, to fulfil this task. The masses of the communities to be provided for, all save small advanced sections, must be regarded and dealt with as if they were living and had their being, like our own ancestors in a bygone century, under the domination of religion.

There are still two matters of minor importance, which had better receive a little consideration before we proceed further. They are the conditions of moral improvement and reformation.

CHAPTER VI

MORAL IMPROVEMENT AND REFORMATION

WE announced at the outset that one of the objects aimed at was to make the Indian peoples attain a political apprenticeship and ethos, approaching those of the best elements, with which they were associated.

Now India is a very wide country, containing many nations differing in history, race, character, and religion. Moral training adapted to all these diversities must include very many varieties, widely apart, and must begin in each case with the present conditions of the particular unit under instruction. How is it possible, it may be asked, to unite and combine all these different features so as to reach a tolerably approximate character? Has this been considered; has any arrangement been provided, calculated to secure this desirable object? The candid admission is, that no such provision has been made, but it is maintained that nothing of the sort is needed, because every improvement in morals has a convergent effect, and will of itself tend to cause characters to approximate. All men are pretty near agreement about what conduct is good or bad, right or wrong. Good men, wherever they have come from or however diverse their up-bringing, it is the general experience, have no difficulty in getting on with each other, when they meet. If it were otherwise, the idea of a Heavenly Paradise, common to so many religions, would obviously be absurd. There are certain characters in history whom all men, in all ages, of all religions, have admired, for example Pericles, Epaminondas, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Sadi. The behaviour of the whole of vocal India at the outbreak of this war is a good illustration of the view contended for. Vocal India may be regarded as representing the small advanced sections in the local communities, into which the population would be divided from a religious standpoint for administrative purposes. A great moral problem, seriously affecting every one, was

suddenly presented and it was answered with a unanimity which must have charmed the dwellers in all the lands of the Empire. The following is a good sample of what was common throughout the Indian Press at the time :—

“India’s duty is clear to-day She has never forgotten a benefit and never wavered, when the call of friendship demanded great sacrifices. Our great men have given their lives, their homes and their all for their friends. We are faced to-day by a common danger. The fate of India is interlinked with the future of England. Our duty is to stand as men so that the memory of our deeds may nerve the forces of coming generations.

“Let us fight shoulder to shoulder in this great cause as a band of brothers. It is not always that the faith of a nation is put to trial. We have got a rare opportunity. Let us keep our faith in the wisdom of the Government. Let us nerve our hearts with the justice of our cause. There can be no question as to the issue. We must win.”¹

In the next place it appears desirable that the principle of the specific to be recommended for our ailment, should be explained in advance. It depends, it will appear, on the power of habit and of mental adjustment to suit confirmed habit.

Our complaint doubtless has its root in religion. Religions have a common feature ; they are all framed in terms of the eternal : “One day is as a thousand years,” in each case. Yet religions, it must be admitted, have a beginning ; they develop ; their existence falls short of eternity ; they disappear. The Polytheisms of the Mediterranean basin are gone , so also the Teutonic. Buddhism has mostly vanished from the Indian Continent, which it at one time pervaded. We know something of the history of Christianity. I pointed out what appeared to me a development as regards the recognition of conscience, as a guide for human conduct. At the Christian era slavery was universally prevalent, the slave population being perhaps in excess of the free (Gibbon, Cap II). Slaves were recommended to be obedient even to bad masters for conscience’ sake (1 Pet. ii. 18). The institution, thus recognised in the sphere of conscience, has disappeared among Christians in our time, as the result of a tremendous war. All the great religions took their rise prior to the discovery of the correct mechanism of the Universe

¹ Pamphlet, “The Great War, by Jogendra Singh

and the phenomenal advance of Science, which has ensued. Science is a human possession of a different character from religion ; ever under repair, it waxeth not old, so far as we know or can calculate. It proceeds on the principle of the Continuity and Uniformity of Nature, which is flagrantly at variance with many religious traditions. This clash of principle does not disturb many of the greatest intellects but it unsettles some, resulting in scepticism, unbelief, and rebellion against social usages and duties.

In such a predicament what is the best remedy or palliative which can be suggested and how does it operate ? The mischief to be overcome in India, like the advent of Science in the East, is a comparatively recent thing, but the West has had centuries of experience of the complaint. The result is, that the West would appear to be thoroughly convinced that the best plan is to give good heed to the old proverb : " Train up a child in the way he should go ; and when he is old he will not depart from it." This means that every child, in the course prescribed for him, will have full instruction according to his years both in religious and moral principles, and all the time he will be required to live in accordance therewith ; if he come short in any respect, he will find his life anything but a bed of roses. When religious truths are imparted to him, as he matures in years, he will be furnished with reasons for accepting them, sufficiently powerful to make him think once, twice, and again, before he thinks of parting with the beliefs to which he has been inured. After protracted consideration he may come to the conclusion, that what he was taught in his childhood is unsound, and that he must find something more reasonable and more reliable to replace it. He thus becomes converted, we shall say, to a new set of beliefs and he may have to modify his conduct accordingly. All the time this religious debate has been going on internally, he has been treading in the old paths, indulging in old habits, which have become a second nature to him ; he will not dispense with any of them save with the utmost regret. He will maintain his confirmed attitude to relations, old friends, acquaintances and the society of which he was a member in all respects, so far as this is possible. A pathetic instance on record will serve to illustrate the position. I am to quote a few sentences from Sterling's last letter to his friend Carlyle. Sterling had been an English clergyman, and in the course of time had found himself compelled to part with

some Christian beliefs, among them, it would appear, the cardinal belief in a future life. The letter begins—

“ MY DEAR CARLYLE,

“ For the first time for many months it seems possible to send you a few words ; merely, however, for remembrance and Farewell. On higher matters there is nothing to say. I tread the common road into the great darkness without any thought of fear and with very much of hope. Certainty indeed I have none. . . . Heaven bless you ! If I can lend you a hand when there that will not be wanting.”

We see that the effect of an important change of belief was to produce a mental adjustment ; to replace certainty by hope. Similar changes of belief might have the effect of expunging many pages of religious traditionary records, as altogether incredible. Similar mental readjustments would replace them, if necessary with the best available substitutes without any anarchy or social disturbance.

Something of this sort is what occurs in the green tree in the West under most favourable conditions. We are now witnessing what occurs in the dry tree in India, where youths are crammed by the Higher Education with anything that will win marks in examinations for advancement in life. Conduct and character are taken no account of. The acquisition of any knowledge of religion and morals is of no avail whatever, however essential it may be to a well-ordered and useful life. Hot-headed youths, who have failed in examinations, on reaching manhood, lose their bearings and find no career so attractive as forming large bands to commit raids and robberies. The specious pretext is, that they wish to secure resources in order to liberate India from an alien Government, whose hands are full with a great war elsewhere. In the Panjab alone in the first half of May, 1915, two Special Tribunals were sitting for the trial of 2121 of such misguided would-be rebels and other malcontents, who have adopted their weapon of organised robberies in order to redress their grievances.

We shall now proceed to explain proposals for calling to our assistance the wise men of the East, in order to extract from their stores of wisdom, the requisite materials for teaching the young to love good habits and ever to choose the path of virtue.

CHAPTER VII

REMEDIAL MEASURES

So far no reference has been made to the reports of the Bombay and Allahabad Conferences on Moral Education, referred to in the Introduction. I am not conscious that I have been influenced by them in the foregoing discussions, which were for the most part complete before receipt of the reports. The great value, I attach to them, is due to their use for verification

The gist of these pages is contained in this sentence of the address of the Lord Bishop of Bombay :—"For I should have thought that at least one possible solution of this problem is, that at school the children of each religion should receive teaching in the morality inculcated by that religion." I have been busy so far in supporting this thesis and what remains to be done is, to supply one working plan for putting it in execution. I am quite ready to believe that much better schemes could be furnished. The Bishop was strongly supported by two other speakers ; one of them a Roman Catholic clergyman. Of two other speakers one placed his chief reliance on the inspiring influence of the teacher, expounding and practising sound morality, and the other on the excellent advantages of a good home. We may adhere to our own conclusions with fullest confidence without calling in question the enormous advantages of first-rate teachers and admirable homes, if they were only procurable.

The Allahabad Conference might be said to be all but unanimous as to the desirability of moral and religious instruction proceeding hand in hand. There was not a single suggestion pointing to any means of obtaining this inestimable boon in Government schools, while the unalterable policy of the Government was adhered to. The method of moral instruction without religious instruction, with accounts of the attitudes of parents and others towards it, had been fully laid before the Conference in careful reports of the Directors of Public Instruction, expressly prepared for the Conference. A

Muhammadian member of the Conference did not mince matters in giving his opinion as to the value of the method ; he pronounced it a farce. This *pis aller* of so-called Direct Moral Instruction must be regarded as having the verdict of the Conference in its favour, seeing that its members were unable to propound anything to replace it. It may be as well to explain the nature of the tuition. Books have been provided for class lessons of a literary, historical, geographical or other nature with a moral tendency. The teacher is expected not only to give the particular lesson effectively, but also to enforce with power and enthusiasm any morals that may be extracted from it by the way ; even by personal example " to illustrate and sanctify the efficacy of their precepts to young minds." I am quoting the words of a Deputy Inspector. If the teacher fails to accomplish all this, it is not because the scheme is not a sound one, but because he should be regarded as a failure. I have commented on Direct Moral Instruction unfavourably on two previous occasions, and any number of objections could be urged against it, if the task were not too ungrateful. Enough has been said, I trust, to enable readers to judge for themselves. The best that could be said of it was, that it was a courageous effort to find a way out of the impossible *impasse*, caused by the necessary embargo on religion for moral teaching, due to the Government policy. The Government must be disappointed by the outcome ; for it is not prepared to go boldly forward but prefers to wait and see what further light may be shed on the problem. The position is doubtless an awkward one but under the circumstances the decision seems to me a right and proper one. I will explain why.

India may well be regarded as the most difficult country in the world to deal with as regards moral teaching. Owing to its history, to the various origins of its races, to the various conquests that have occurred within historical times and before them, to the devices adopted by the conquerors to maintain their superiority to their predecessors and to the aborigines, and owing also to the various religions of the inhabitants, due to all these causes, it may safely be maintained that there are not merely one, two, or three systems of morality current but an indefinite and unknown number, corresponding to the various religions which have grown up with and dominated them. From a material point of view all the conquests save the latest have only been partial. From the religious

and spiritual standpoint there has never been any conquest at all. My meaning will be apparent from a comparison with Europe. The Christian religion has pervaded all Europe and in consequence there is there practically only one religion and one moral system, because the religious divisions do not affect morals. Europeans, when they go to India, take their morals with them, and naturally proceed to apply everywhere the notion of the single system. There are exceptions; the Lord Bishop of Bombay for instance takes full cognisance of the fact to which I am endeavouring to draw attention. Other people have glimmerings of it one moment and forget it the next. This may be illustrated from the quoted paragraph of the Resolution. Reference is made first to what we may call the Cosmopolitan morality to be found in the class text-books, gathered we may say from promiscuous sources and distributed to all pupils indiscriminately. A little further on we find reference to the ethical teachings to be found in the classical writers of various Eastern Countries. One might be excused for inquiring why, if moral materials gathered from anywhere were suitable for Indian pupils, there was any need to rummage for them in ancient classics, was this not great waste of labour and effort? The truth is that there is in many minds a notion half alive, that material from these ancient books might be very congenial and suitable to Indians, but there is not in the same minds even a suspicion that the former materials ought *prima facie* to be regarded as quite unsuitable. This is my contention, which I laboured to establish when I proposed a definition of morality suitable to Indian conditions and especially to the business of the Indian Education Department.

We must, I say, recognise numerous moralities in India in consequence of the present condition of its peoples, all divided into distinct social communities, separated from each other by rifts and fissures or by vast ravines. This recognition is the only means of advancement, the only resource, which affords a hope that they may in time be brought into a state of approximate continuous homogeneity. Meanwhile each community, each moral ¹ unit

¹ Nevertheless, we have here (in Berar) on the whole a fair average sample of Hinduism, as it exists at this time throughout the greater part of India; for we know that the religion varies in different parts of this vast country with endless diversities of detail. *Berar Gazetteer*, by Sir. A. Lyall.

Of course if there be many varieties of religion, there must be as many of morality.—A. H. B.

must have its own approximate moral treatment, if there is to be peace in the land. The Directors' reports seem to confirm these views. The people they consulted seemed hardly to understand what is meant by morals; some say they do not wish moral teaching, but they are all keen for having religion taught, the real fact being that religion according to their conception includes morals. They are, as already remarked, so far as the domination of religion is concerned, where our ancestors were some centuries back. It seems a piece of good fortune accordingly that the Government thought proper to call a halt.

Having read so much in the various Reports about school discipline, obedience, respect for superiors and so on, I am led to suggest that a great moral improvement might be effected by slight physical training calculated to produce correct bearing and deportment. Village louts and yokels should not appear as such in the schools but be smartened up into the beginnings of men. I am induced to give this advice in consequence of what I see of our "Boy Scouts."

~~In pursuing~~ In pursuing the evidence with regard to Direct Moral Instruction, our attention is constantly called to the existence of a sinister phenomenon, pervading Indian school life. It distresses alike all pupils and teachers, who admire honest work and fair play. In consequence of it neither pupils nor teachers have any time to bestow on either religion or morals. The sole cause of the trouble is the Examination Fiend, who, like the Government, is precluded from interfering with religion, but is entitled to do his Devil's work in every other sphere. An unfair handicap is thus imposed on all who give fair attention to religion and morals, and a premium is bestowed on those who do not scruple to neglect them. There ought to be no hesitation about penalising the latter. The examination for Matriculation and all such like avenues for advancement in life ought to be duly guarded by a pass-examination in religion and morals, as matters of the first importance, and by an ample deduction of marks in cases where the test is not fully satisfied. We are assured by J. S. Mill ("Liberty," p. 193), who should be a good authority on such a subject, that there is no reasonable objection to examining an atheist in the evidences of Christianity, provided he is not required to profess a belief in them. Still less ought there to be any objection to examining pupils in morals and the religion

they profess. It would be a fine feat indeed to make this fiend exorcise himself.

I would not have it supposed that I attach any very serious importance to the suggestions offered in the two preceding paragraphs, as contributions to the solution of our problem. They may be regarded as mere *obiter dicta* arising out of the discussion. The solution to which I attach high importance is based on the fact that it has been proved, we may say twice over, that the task of teaching morals, to be efficiently performed, must be handed over to independent authorities who are not prohibited from invoking the aid of religion for the purpose.

It is proposed accordingly that independent committees be constituted in each district, to give moral instruction to the pupils of all Government and Grant-in-aid Primary Schools in accordance with the religion of the pupil, not in the schools but in separate buildings specially adapted for the purpose. It is quite well understood that independence is a virtue, which cannot be conferred on a small body of men in an ordinary Indian District by a simple fiat. It will have to be cherished and built up in process of time by measures, sedulously contrived to attain that object. It should be understood, that the primary qualification for any gentleman's being appointed to serve on such a committee would be a religious one. In India all religious organisations, such as there are, are merely local. The authorities in one place have no control over authorities elsewhere. Gentlemen would be appointed to the committees merely as individuals. In short there is no spiritual authority of the nature of a Church, and it would be a great mistake to do anything to create one.

Let us suppose for the present, that suitable authorities of the right sort, open to no objection, have been properly constituted. The next thing to be settled is the method of instruction. It must be remembered that we are not dealing with advanced students of morals, capable of understanding definitions and reasoning based thereon, but with children who must be supplied with matter suitable to their intelligence and who must take what they are told for the most part on trust. It is submitted that the matter taught must be couched in the form of a precept, felicitously expressed in simple terms, which even a child can understand, in terms calculated, however, by their force and charm to produce a

lasting impression on the youthful mind. Moral maxims of this high character can only be the product of moral discernment of no mean order, and in some cases it may be no easy task to discover and arrange them. There is a profuse abundance of the treasure demanded in Christian ethics ; there must also, it is believed, be very ample store in the text-books of the Buddhist tenets.

In support of my contention as to the method of teaching I would ask Christian readers to look within their own breasts, and to ask themselves with respect to their moral notions, on which they set the highest value, from what source they have obtained them ? Is it not directly from the Gospel precepts or indirectly through the society imbued with these precepts, in which they have spent their lives ? I should be immensely surprised to hear from them, that they were to any sensible extent indebted for the moral thoughts they treasure most either to the treatises of moral philosophers or to catechisms. To illustrate this matter reference may be made to the Westminster Shorter Catechism, a subject of arduous study in the Scotch schools, which were established in every parish in consequence of the proposals of the Reformer John Knox, and which continued in existence down to the seventies of last century. The Catechism dealt at length with Effectual Calling, Justification, Adoption, and Sanctification. Nevertheless, in after life, when the Catechism was once got rid of, who ever gave a thought to these terms, which puzzled childhood, or heard of them in private conversation, or saw any allusion to them in the newspaper press or in any non-theological work ? I entertain the sincere hope that both Hindus and Muhammadans may, if called on, have similar accounts to give regarding their religious possessions. The method of teaching may of course have to be varied, to adapt it to the means available and to the customs and usages of the localities and of the races concerned.

Our next task is to settle how the Committees above proposed for presiding over religious and moral instruction should be constituted. We must remember that throughout British India the unit of Local administration is the district. Each district is in charge of the Collector and Magistrate or of the Deputy Commissioner ; it has its District Board of which the Collector or Deputy Commissioner is Chairman. The Collector would be required to determine how the population should be divided from a religious

standpoint into communities for religious and moral instruction, so that a committee might be appointed to represent each, to arrange its business with the District and Municipal Boards to draw up a religious and moral syllabus and to provide suitable buildings and establishment. Each committee's scheme would have to be approved by the District and Municipal Boards, which would have to defray the cost.

In preparing the syllabus the present religious and moral condition of the community would be the starting point as already indicated in Chapters II., IV., and V. (pp. 29, 71, 85). The committee's business would be to maintain and improve the present status. In some cases the preparation of the syllabus would be easy, in some it might no doubt be a formidable business. The Muhammadans might be expected to be sticklers for the directions of the Kuran and the Hadis, and might not care to admit much from extraneous sources; this would save the trouble of choosing. It would be for the Boards to decide whether the matter submitted was easily intelligible, sufficient and worth its cost. In the case of some of the committees there may not be available the learning in their own religious lore or the talent to manipulate it. Many of the committees would possess, it is presumed, exactly the same features and the less learned and clever committees might be advised and induced to copy the work of abler committees with like characteristics in other districts. Outside assistance might perhaps be obtained from the central Hindu College, Benares, and like bodies. All the difficulties in the way will only be discovered when an effort is made to surmount them. The first attempts should be regarded as a voyage of discovery in a new country. In selecting the first committee the Collector would of course consider, who among the leaders of the community seemed best qualified to deal with this important business and with the starting-off the committee on its career.

It is suggested that in every case a section of the syllabus should be devoted to special local matter, moral proverbs, hymns and folk songs; also that each item of the collection should, if possible, have a marginal catchword

Vacancies in the committees might be filled by co-optation.

It strikes me, that both to the District Boards and to the Committees it would be a great boon to have a pattern syllabus provided for them, even if it were for a different religion, say the

Christian. The former would be able to decide by reference to the pattern, what was worthy of approval ; the latter would understand what sort of product it was necessary for them to work up to, in order to obtain due sanction for their expenditure. I would suggest that it would be worth while for the Government to offer several handsome prizes for good specimens of a syllabus in the best literary style, drawn up according to directions supplied. With a view to the issue of such directions I will offer such ideas as occur to me.

It would be necessary to restrict the pattern, to a convenient size, say 50 to 100 pages or so many words. It would contain a narrative of the barest facts of Christ's life, simply told, with the most important Gospel precepts embodied. The precepts would be selected and simply copied. The selection would extend to other books of the New Testament and contain two or three texts regarding conscience. It would also extend to the Old Testament and to secular literature, both ancient and modern. I have not given much consideration to the secular side of the business ; I will merely give a few specimens that occur to me at the moment, which might possibly find a place in the collection :—

From Homer :

“ Aye to be first ; fore all the rest ”

From Aristotle's Ethics :

“ As it is not one swallow or one fine day that makes a summer, so it is not one day or a short time, that makes a man blessed or happy.”

From Terence :

“ Being a man, nothing concerning man is outside my concern ”

From Kant, the declaration about the two infinities :

“ The starry heavens above and the moral law within.”

From Milton, the last two lines of the VIIth Sonnet :

“ All is, if I have grace to use it so,
As ever in my great Taskmaster's eye ”

From Carlyle :

“ Do the duty which lies nearest ”
—“ Sartor Resartus,” Bk. 2. 9

I ought not to part with this proposal of a model without stating that I am in this matter suggesting imitation, as exactly as possible, of the procedure of the greatest Moralist of Humanity. His followers

now number in all the continents about one-third of mankind. They are progressive and powerful and may be regarded as controlling the affairs of the world; the destinies of India are committed to one of their nations.

The attention of each committee should be specially directed to the character of the precepts, so that they may be stimulated to ransack their great resources, in order to make a selection to match them, as nearly as possible. They were not arrived at by any reasoning, which common people could not be expected to appropriate and digest. They were propounded in plain terms, which the meanest could understand. They were characterised by charming simplicity, by artistic point and vigour, also by sweet and winning reasonableness, which commended them to the people at large. They were astonished, we are told, at His doctrine; great popular commotions were the result. There was, moreover, always a religious spirit enforcing the ethical doctrine; there were constant allusions to the Father Almighty. In the first address, of which we have any account, we find the words: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father, which is in heaven."

It may be noted with regret that Animists and Primitive Tribes are outside our purview. The writer does not see how any recommendation can be made to the Government to go so low down as to have dealings of the nature suggested with believers in magic, sorcery, witchcraft, and such-like superstitions. I may be doing these classes injustice through unacquaintance with their character. I will therefore leave their case in the hands of persons who are able to profess that they do not lie under any such incapacity for handling it. It is to be hoped that the ten millions of Indian peoples in the condition supposed may in the process of civilisation, whether by conversion or otherwise, attain a higher status, which would permit of their case being dealt with on the ordinary lines.

I have begun by explaining my proposals with regard to the pupils of elementary schools, because I wish to propound a complete scheme. So far, however, there is little harm being done in respect of pupils whose education stops at the elementary stage as has been noted (pp. 52-4). Their case is not urgent and the cost of dealing with them as a whole would be considerable, perhaps as much as an increase of 25 per cent. on the whole cost of education. The

plague spot is in the Higher Schools and Colleges. It appears expedient to begin with them or better still with a convenient portion of them. If the plan succeeded with this portion, the experiment could be extended to the whole and afterwards, when there was no fear of failure, to the whole Indian system, primary as well as secondary.

Suppose that it were decided to make the proposed experiment in any portion of a Province, private schools, receiving no support from Government, would have to be excluded from the operation. Without some legislation of a trivial character, it might not be possible to obtain from them the necessary facilities with regard to the adjustment of their time-tables, so as to enable the pupils at certain times to be absent for moral instruction. In no secondary schools or colleges of any description would there be any change in the programme of their studies or their arrangements save the proposed alteration of the time-tables. The buildings necessary for the new instruction would have to be found in the immediate neighbourhood or almost next door, so to speak, in order that as little time as possible might be lost in moving from the place of secular instruction to the other and *vice versa*. The moral instruction would be quite independent of the secular, subject to a different authority and a different inspection; it would constitute a new department in the administration. Ethics would be treated as an entirely separate study, just like music, dancing, gymnastics, carpentry or the like. There would be a variety of ethical studies, to meet the wants of pupils of different religions and of different sects of the same religion. The pupils in each case would obtain their instruction by themselves; at the time of teaching there would be no intermingling and no contact with pupils of a different section. The buildings would have to be sufficiently extensive to permit of teaching being conducted according to the method suggested. It would be necessary that the authorities controlling both departments of education should be mutually obliging and accommodating for other reasons, but especially for the adjustment of the time-tables, so as, so far as possible, to secure economy in building.

The arrangements for securing suitable text-books would be the same as suggested in the case of the elementary schools. The head of the District, or some authority independent of the Department

of Education, would take the place of the District or Municipal Board in dealing with the committees charged with ethical education. These committees would require to be sufficiently numerous to meet the wants of the pupils attending the secular school. If there were very few pupils of any particular class, special provision would have to be made for them, unless the number was deemed negligible. Exemption from attendance at ethical instruction would be obtainable by parents from the head of the district or some one appointed by him for the purpose. It seems unnecessary to attempt further to elaborate details; difficulties will no doubt present themselves, but they will have to be disposed of, when they make their appearance.

The Government would have to meet the whole cost of the experiment, whatever other arrangement might be found possible and fair, after it had succeeded.

If the remedies suggested were found to answer, after being duly tested, and if they were extended accordingly, any adjustments shown by experience to be desirable being from time to time adopted, it might well be calculated that, instead of a few anarchists continuing to cause quite a disproportionate amount of commotion and unrest, there would be a great increase in the spirit of loyalty. The proper respect shown on all hands to the various Indian religions by the Government and by its officials and, mutually, by force of example by the various communities themselves should serve to increase the bonds of social union and to dispel causes of strife and illwill. Each individual affected by these measures should be enabled to feel some inches taller; he would be more determined than ever to support the authority, which not only protected the frontiers and maintained internal peace, but by arduous efforts in conjunction with the various communities sought by their moral improvement in accordance with their religious beliefs to minimise their ancient and outstanding differences, so as thereby to promote cohesion and to make them fairly homogeneous citizens, worthy of a great Empire.

We have dealt with a great variety of subjects. Our discussions have travelled over extensive fields in Time, in the East and in the West. Considering their varied and discursive character it appears highly advantageous that here in conclusion I should attempt to

gather together and briefly to set out the results we have arrived at as follows :—

1. At the outset I explained the high importance of the problem to be solved, for India, for the British Empire, even for the world at large. The clear invitation to render assistance in dealing with it was noted. The diversified nature of the discussion to be pursued in the fields of religion, morals, state action, philosophy, and history, as applied to a country with a number of special features pervading it, was outlined.

2. These special features included geological formation and boundaries, uniformities in respect of land settlement, administration, mode of human habitation and a peculiar social frame-work—caste to wit, corresponding to the prior conditions. The conclusion after examination of each prevalent uniformity was that they all held together, that each was part and parcel of the total complexus of conditions. The high antiquity and importance of the social framework was insisted on. The view of the caste system propounded was, that it was in origin a mere institution of matrimonial associations, gradually and spontaneously developed by the people themselves, in order to provide a supply of brides by ways and means more civilised and satisfactory than the old methods of ~~waiting~~ and kidnapping, recognised even by Manu. The Government experiment of Buddhism in establishing a system of morality in India without spiritual assistance and its ultimate failure was described. The numerous religions prevailing were adverted to ; the difficulty in dealing with the Hindu religion, that of the great mass of the population, was considered and held not to be insurmountable.

3. The action of the Indian Government in education from the outset is curious. The business undertaken at the start was trivial ; it was the useful expenditure of some small sums of money, especially one granted by Parliament in 1813. The Government was perpetually engaged while the conquest of India was in progress, in wars and conquests of immensely vaster importance at the time than the work undertaken in the interests of education, which was handed over to subordinate authorities and under the circumstances received little consideration. So far as appears from the evidence, mere bad luck had much to do with the policy actually adopted. The great English system of mutual toleration in religion, the very ideal of

a policy for a country with more religions than any other, was apparently never thought of. Its place was taken by an obscure half-and-half arrangement of a plausible character, called neutrality in matters of religion, which has never been explained, perhaps never effectually thought out; it has been shown to be very distracting and misleading, even when handled by the highest talent. It is incompatible with, and of quite a different spirit from, the system of toleration. It appears to fix its attention on that part of the field of toleration which restricts the open action of the State in matters of religion and forbids proselytism and interference with religious observances. In practice it at the same time leaves room for unlimited interference with religions by indirect action, by the teaching of foreign sciences and literatures without any precautions taken, which has proved and is proving very deleterious.

The Despatch of 1854, called the Magna Charta of Indian Education, in most respects an admirable State-paper ignored religion and morality. It made no provision for teaching either; it depended for maintaining and improving morality altogether on the culture of the intellect.

A Commission was issued in India in 1882 to many experts of high distinction to inquire and report, how the provisions of this Despatch had been carried out. It made elaborate inquiries and it appears to have performed its task very satisfactorily in other respects, but unfortunately it gave no finding as to how far the so-called neutrality in matters of religion had been observed. There are indications that, if it had, a very serious and disappointing state of affairs would have been disclosed. The blame for this failure is to be ascribed both to oversight on the part of the Commission, which disregarded the general directions, and to the special instructions given it, in which the words "morals" and "religion" do not appear. The occurrence of these oversights is all the more surprising, seeing that prominent attention had been directed to the fact that the policy of neutrality was destroying religious belief by Howell's Note, pp. 34, 35 (Appendix I.). The Commission proposed for colleges a moral text-book based on natural religion. The proposal was opposed to the system of toleration; very properly it has received no attention.

4. It was shown that in the West for the last 3000 years, where Polytheisms of a kindred character had prevailed, religion had been

dominated by the State, until this system was changed at the time of the English Revolution. Then the first step was taken in the system of Toleration, which has since been completed and should be held applicable to all Governments under British auspices. The system is political and philosophic; it is not in origin a Christian principle; it is equally applicable to other religions, including the Muhammadan, for instance, in times of settled peace when no religious war (Jihad) is on foot. We went through the philosophy of the subject and we noted, so far as necessary, the legislation, by which it was applicable to the Government of India, but for the policy of so-called neutrality, adopted by Government on the executive side. That policy was shown to be at variance with the practice of the Government of India on various important occasions, also to be destructive of Indian religions and to allow no sufficient elbow room in dealing with morality and religion. It ought to be abandoned, and some such policy adopted instead as the following:—

“The Government will regard all religions with impartial favour and respect; it will repress all acts which violate law, humanity, justice, or decency and all infringements of the rights of property, notwithstanding any plea of justification on religious grounds.”

Or, to put it briefly, “Impartial favour for all religions with maintenance of the Law.” This is a condition precedent to the provision of effective remedies. its adoption would immensely improve the political situation and facilitate well-considered administration.

5. By philosophical discourse, based on the nature of religion and morality, and also on the experience of history, I sought to prove that instruction in morals must go hand in hand with instruction in religion. Religion, swaying human feeling through the imagination, I found to be the living motive power in operation, essential to producing and maintaining the required impression of the moral teaching imparted on the youthful mind. I felt assured, as we proceeded, that the arguments were sound. Assurance was rendered doubly sure, when it appeared that practically the whole weight of the opinions of the best experts in India enforced this view; also that the Government, in dealing with its most urgent educational problem, has thereby been driven to inaction and deliberation for a number of years, we may say, ever since the Allahabad Conference of February, 1911.

We searched through history, ancient and modern, in order to acquire an acquaintance with the dealings of Governments with religion at various eras, and to ascertain what power the individual conscience was able to exercise at different stages. In ancient times religion controlled by the State dominated conduct; conscience had no weight of any consequence in comparison; it was not appealed to as an authority by Aristotle throughout the Ethics. In Rome, on the other hand, before the beginning of our era, in a community, in this and in many other respects unique, conscience had already obtained full stature. In the first century (60 A.D.) St. Paul, addressing converts in Rome, indicated it as a guide for human conduct, on a level with the Jewish Law. He and his fellow-workers regarded it as of equal authority with the Gospel they were preaching. Their example was followed down through the ages not only by Christian divines, but also by philosophers. Bishop Butler was the first who put the two authorities in competition, and he decided in favour of conscience. Recent philosophy gives conscience the paramount place in regulating human conduct. Mankind at the present hour may be divided into two sections: first, those whose conduct is dominated by their religion; secondly, those who can say their conduct is regulated by their conscience. Putting a large section of the European population into the more advanced category, we must declare that the Indian masses, all save a small portion of the educated fraction, who are on the same footing as most of the ruling race, belong to the first section; they are dominated by their religion and must be treated accordingly. Religion controls their manners and morals, as it did those of our ancestors who lived in the period prior to the initiation of toleration by the Toleration Act. So it follows, that if Government cannot interfere with the religions of its Indian subjects, as admittedly it cannot, so neither can it interfere with teaching them morals. In accord with this result, the people themselves, as was observed, quite generally conceive religion as including morals. The result arrived at is, that for the teaching of morals independent bodies, subject to no disabilities, must be created and cherished.

6. The most important point of all to remember in discussing morals for youthful Indians is, that India is not Europe but quite a place by itself with numerous unique features. In Europe there is practically only one religion and one moral system. I have

maintained that owing to the events of history, immigrations, conquests, divisive policies, there are, so far as teaching the young is concerned, an unknown number of moral systems in India. I do not mean to say that they are essentially different—quite the reverse. The differences will be found in the form of expression, in the incidents chosen to express ideas, in the religious conceptions by which conduct is to be guided. I have also contended that the highest morality under all systems when perfected, is as nearly as possible identical. Many persons, I admit, show some signs of knowing how the case stands, but it seems only a glimmering notion they have: the next moment it is forgotten. The Government of India, for instance, seems to treat morality as if it were a drug or a chemical of uniform quality. It draws attention to the quantities of the article available in this, that, and the other quarter; it treats the special qualities of morality as of no consequence whatever, as if they had no existence.

Well, it is maintained in the sense just indicated that there are in India many moralities. If children are to be taught morals, they must be dealt with as they are received from the bosom of their families; the ways and manners, the religious and moral notions of the particular home must be suitably continued and, if possible, improved; all arrangements must be made on this basis. There must be authorities independent of Government, representing the various communities, regarded from religious standpoints, authorities who are not precluded from teaching religion and the teaching must be imparted in ways and forms adapted to the intelligence of the child. The Committees representing the various communities would in the first instance be appointed by the Head of the District; they might be maintained by co-optation. It would be their duty to draw up a suitable syllabus for religious and moral teaching, to appoint teachers, to arrange with the District and Municipal Boards for the times and places of teaching. Everything would have to be sanctioned by the District Boards, which would bear the cost.

The introduction of a system of moral instruction is not so urgent in the elementary schools as in the higher schools and colleges, where the plague spot is to be found. Any scheme propounded had better form the subject of an experiment, on any scale deemed expedient, in the higher schools, before its general

application to them, in case of success, and then to the elementary schools. All risk of failure would by this procedure be avoided.

The scheme, it is hoped, sets forth one practical method of laying the moral foundation of that great destiny which India and its peoples may in the course of ages, by the favour of Providence, hope to attain. I shall be delighted if some better way be discovered. I shall be abundantly rewarded if this effort of mine should in any measure contribute to an object which I desire with all my heart to further.

•